

reports and to file notices of motions to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I move that the Senate now stand adjourned.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 11, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 7 (legislative day, June 4), 1956:

##### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

David A. Hamill, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years, vice Anchor Nelsen, resigned.

##### BOARD OF PAROLE

John E. Henry, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1962. Mr. Henry is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires September 30, 1956.

Scovel Richardson, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1962. Mr. Richardson is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires September 30, 1956.

William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Fred L. Wham, retired.

#### WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 7 (legislative day, June 4), 1956:

##### POSTMASTERS

Beulah M. Kitchens to be postmaster at Greenwood, in the State of Nebraska.

Spencer H. Mayes to be postmaster at Graham, in the State of Texas.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1956

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who didst watch over us during the night and hast brought us to this new day, we rejoice that Thou are willing to accept our prayer and answer every sincere petition.

We pray that our whole life may be adorned with the noble virtues of gratitude and humility, of patience and perseverance, of fidelity and courage, of love and good will.

Defend and fortify our minds and hearts against the devastating moods of cynicism and doubt. May we always be disposed to follow Thee in faith and in faithfulness.

Guide us in the difficult decisions which we are daily called upon to make and may we discharge all our duties and responsibilities in devout obedience to Thy holy will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 22, 1956:

H. R. 7228. An act to amend title II of the Act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 8130. An act to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge."

On May 24, 1956:

H. R. 2057. An act for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton;

H. R. 2893. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 5535. An act for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, and S. H. Prather, Jr.; and

H. R. 7164. An act for the relief of Lt. Michael Cullen.

On May 28, 1956:

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 4026. An act for the relief of James C. Hayes;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 6137. An act for the relief of Herman Floyd Williams, Bettie J. Williams, and Alma G. Segers;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson;

H. R. 7186. An act to provide for the review and determination of claims for the return of lands, in the Territory of Hawaii, conveyed to the Government during World War II by organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody; and

H. R. 10875. An act to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

On May 29, 1956:

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall;

H. R. 4162. An act for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris;

H. R. 7030. An act to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands.

On May 31, 1956:

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement.

On June 4, 1956:

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5862. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 7678. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Eleventh Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., and the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 11177. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to donate surplus supplies and equipment for memorial purposes to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2840. An act to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; and

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9536. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

S. 9739. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. POTTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT AND SUNDRY GENERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 9, strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$365,700."

Page 7, line 3, strike out "\$50" and insert "\$75."

Page 7, line 9, strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$400,000."

Page 8, line 1, after "\$1,140,000", insert "of which \$10,000 shall be immediately available for printing relating to the dedication of World War II memorials."

Page 8, line 22, strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,050,000."

Page 9, line 9, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000."

Page 9, line 11, after "Commission", insert "and employment of aliens."

Page 9, line 12, strike out "\$795,000" and insert "\$800,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 9536, as passed by the other body, is \$120,700 over the amount originally approved by the House. The increases in detail are, first, \$15,700 for the Council of Economic Advisers; second, \$50,000 for the President's fund for expenses of management improvement; third, \$50,000 to initiate a very worthwhile project in the American Battle Monuments Commission; and, fourth, \$5,000 for salaries and expenses for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

The committee is in agreement with the changes made, and the present total of the bill, \$14,969,975, remains below the budget estimates by the sum of \$44,500.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Bell	Gray	Norblad
Berry	Gubser	O'Hara, Minn.
Boiling, Mo.	Gwinn	Patman
Bush	Hale	Pilcher
Cannon	Harden	Pillion
Carlyle	Herlong	Polk
Carnahan	Jones, Mo.	Powell
Dawson, Ill.	Kee	Reed, N. Y.
Deane	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Diggs	Kilburn	Sikes
Dowdy	Lane	Thompson, La.
Eberhart	Lankford	Thornberry
Frazier	Lesinski	Velde
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Gordon	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### BROOKLYN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 127 years ago, the Brooklyn Sunday School Union was founded. Every year since then on the first Thursday in June, all the people of the great borough of Brooklyn provide a celebration of that event that has become known as Anniversary Day. This day is unique in Brooklyn and probably does not have its counterpart anywhere else in the world. Brooklyn is affectionately known far and wide as the Borough

of Churches, and past many of these beautiful edifices 120,000 men, women, and children will march today to mark the event. Those churches are of many denominations, and the adults and children in the impressive parade will represent various faiths and creeds. There will be colorful floats and banners proclaiming the faith of Brooklyn in God and country. Although basically a religious celebration, the event has a distinct civic aspect, and many of the persons in the line of march, as well as in the reviewing stands, will be leaders in all walks of life.

It is truly an inspiring occasion. Brooklynites of faiths not represented in the Sunday School Union are equally glad that they live in a community where such a manifestation of faith can be made with no untoward incidents to mar the event. No one is forced to march—and no one prevented from participating—against his will.

Anniversary Day embodies the spirit of the first amendment to the Constitution that provides that Congress shall make no law representing an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This celebration epitomizes that goal of our Founding Fathers. It is the spontaneous participation of people blessed with the right to worship as they please, but even more than that it demonstrates that although Congress may not establish a state church, we are essentially a religious people, and it was with this knowledge and in this spirit that the Constitution and the first amendment were written.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11356, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the proponents of this annual authorization bill seek to justify it on the ground that it will retard Communist aggression. I do not presume that there is any advocate of this bill who would be so enthusiastic



as to suggest that it will stop Communist aggression. They assert that if it had not been for this foreign-aid appropriation in the past, far more territory and population would have been absorbed by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, it is doubtful that the Communists would have acquired much more territory regardless of these appropriations. As a matter of fact, since 1945 the Soviet Union has acquired by annexation or by subversion and revolution more than 700 million people and 5 million square miles in 17 countries. There never has been in the history of the world a record of conquest to equal this record.

The difficulty the Soviet Union is experiencing is not one of acquisition but of digestion. I do not believe that our efforts in recent years to halt this aggression by the annual appropriation of foreign-aid money have been justified by the results that have been achieved. Too much of these funds have been wasted or spent unwisely to warrant me to vote for this bill especially when it is undisputed that it will require 2 or 3 years to spend what we have already appropriated.

It is true that in the beginning of the program we were justified in seeking to aid the distressed countries of Europe who had just passed through a devastating war and who needed help to help themselves, but the time of the effectiveness of this program has passed. We are seeking to do something that is not possible and is not practicable. This program as now administered reminds me of a middle-aged fat officeholder, well supplied with funds, trying to defeat with money an aggressive, crusading, dynamic young man. However much he spends in newspaper advertising, in radio, and in television, he cannot defeat the enthusiasm, the zeal, and the fighting qualities of his young opponent. To combat communism effectively we must emulate the zeal of the Communists in converting vulnerable areas and peoples to the great principles of freedom and independence.

While we have scattered our money broadcast throughout the world the Soviet Union by the same tactics and the same technique which it employed so successfully in our own country for more than a decade has been winning one country after another. In fact, the Western World has given independence to 22 countries and abandoned 694 million people in an area of 9 million square miles. While America was giving independence to the Philippines, influencing Britain to withdraw from Egypt and the Suez, and France to withdraw from Indochina, and the Dutch from Indonesia, while this process was going on among the western empires, the Soviet Union was steadily replacing the colonialism of the Western Powers with the new type of colonialism of the Soviet Union, which is far more ruthless than anything these people have experienced in the past.

We cannot dispute the history of Russia. It began in 1460 with a tiny principality of 15,000 square miles. Under the Czars it expanded by conquest until

by 1917 Russia had acquired 145 million people and 8 million square miles. Fifty nationalities, 80 separate languages; almost a constant state of rebellion and ruthless extermination of nationalities; the Russification of all the vast people that fell under the iron heel and the mailed fist of the Czars—these were the chief results of Russian aggression. Then, when the Communists employed the technique of the fifth column their conquests exceeded anything that Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, or Catherine, or any of the other rulers of Russia had ever been able to accomplish. Under the Communists Russia now controls more than one-third of the population of this earth. Great Britain has shrunk from one-fourth to one-twentieth, and we in our desperation and paucity of imaginative programs have sought to stem the tide by an expanded WPA. If these funds had been spent wisely to help these people help themselves by practical programs of development the results achieved might have justified this bill.

I have not had the privilege of traveling over the world. In fact, I have never been outside of the United States, and I doubt seriously that those of my colleagues who have had that privilege were able to obtain an accurate picture that is necessary to form a sound conclusion. But I have made it a point to talk with disinterested and impartial people who are acquainted with the situation, and I am not convinced that this money has been spent wisely and that we are justified in continuing it. We act as though there is no limitation to our natural wealth. We proceed on the basis that for some reason America has resources to continue to dump billions of dollars all over the world. We stubbornly refuse to accept the fact that America owes more money than all the rest of the world put together and that we are burdening our own people, not only with excessive taxation today, but that we are bequeathing to our posterity the most staggering burden of public debt ever known in the history of the world.

I know that President Eisenhower wants this program, but President Eisenhower is not infallible. He has made some errors with respect to the Soviet Union in the past. I need only quote excerpts from speeches and writings of the President. During the critical period, to illustrate that the President was under a serious mistake with reference to the Communist Union, for instance he said in 1945:

Americans at that time (autumn of 1945), or at least we in Berlin—saw no reason why the Russian system of government and democracy as practiced by the Western Allies could not live side by side in the world.

Again, on November 16, President Eisenhower said:

The Russians would have nothing to gain from a war with the United States. Nothing guides Russian policy so much as a desire for friendship with the United States.

He said in 1952:

There is no more reason to fear the 190 million backward people living on the Eurasian continent than there is to fear pollywogs swimming down a muddy creek.

I could go on and quote from various statements of the President not to condemn him but simply to show that President Eisenhower during that critical period was laboring under the same illusion, the same misapprehension as were many other leaders, and that he had refused to accept what the Russian leadership had announced repeatedly to the world as being their chief objective, namely, the conquest of the world. Mr. Chairman, this money provided in this bill cannot be used for 2 or 3 years. During this period we can reexamine and reappraise this entire program and put it on a sound and defensible basis; we can at least limit these funds to our actual and potential friends where there will be some assurance of concrete results. Until this is done, Mr. Chairman, I cannot, in good conscience, spend my constituents' hard-earned money or mortgage their future to finance this program.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2, Title I, chapter 1, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is further amended as follows:

(a) In section 103 (a), which relates to authorizations, add the following new paragraph:

"(3) In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter not to exceed \$1,925,000,000, of which not less than \$48 million shall be used to provide assistance to Spain and not more than \$402 million may be used to provide assistance to other European countries, and which shall remain available until expended."

(b) In section 105, strike out subsections (c) and (d).

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, strike out "\$1,925,000,000" and all that follows down through line 6 and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,525,000,000, which shall remain available until expended."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment raises the total figure for military aid by \$600 million. It also removes the limitation on assistance for Europe in order to achieve greater flexibility in the program; and removes the requirement for a fixed amount for Spain. There would be no doubt whatever about Spain's receiving the amount carried in the bill but my amendment removes the reference since the increase would provide for it.

It is with reluctance that I take the floor today. That is partly due to the fact that I find myself opposed to my beloved chairman. While I would not embarrass him by repeating things that were said yesterday, I know his heart is warmed by the tributes that have been paid him as a great legislator.

The State of South Carolina has contributed many distinguished men to the national service, but none has exhibited a finer quality of statesmanship or added

greater luster to its fame. I make this personal reference to indulge myself the pleasure of a tribute to a dear friend. And yet, in all the 14 years we have worked together in this House he has never asked me to do anything that was not consistent with what I regarded as my legislative duty.

This is a matter of conscience. I was prepared to support some reduction in the request for mutual security funds. I determined in my own thinking early in the hearings, however, that the figures had been pretty carefully evaluated and that in view of continuing dangers the committee should consider proposals to cut with a sense of caution.

There are two reasons for my feeling that \$600 million of the \$1 billion cut should be restored. One is that this is an authorization, not an appropriation bill, and I would like to leave to our skilled Appropriations Committee as much latitude as possible with a measure that is so vital. I do not labor the point because I am not sure they can find room for much reduction.

The President of the United States, who is not only the Commander in Chief but one who led us in the greatest war in history, regards the figure I have included in my amendment as a minimum. I feel we should yield to his judgment on this point. I am not abdicating my own responsibility. I have taken responsibility in past legislative differences for my own views which differed from that of the President of the United States. But in this area it seems to me we should give great weight to his recommendation.

He did not call the leadership on both sides of the House into conference a few hours ago for a pleasant conversation. It was only the sense of gravity about our Nation's security and the future of our freedom that dictated his remarks on that occasion. We all know in substance what was said at that time.

So I offer this as one of the principal reasons for supporting an increase in the amount as reported by the committee.

We just heard an address by a distinguished Member of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES], and we always listen with great interest to him. He speaks of the terror of the Soviet machine, and who can doubt that? But has my friend forgotten that since the end of 1947 not a single square yard has been taken from the free forces of Europe? And the chief element in that was, of course, the help we extended to our allies and our friends in this struggle for survival.

I know that \$600 million which I propose to add to this bill is a lot of money. But it should be considered in relation to the productiveness of the Nation. It is fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of our gross national product. If this should be a mistake we would have added but a slight strain on the tremendous capacity of our Nation to produce the sinews of defense. We are not engaged in war. We are engaged in building a deterrent to war. These efforts are justified on no other basis.

The President on January 11 released a statement that had the unanimous

support of your delegation to the United Nations in the 10th General Assembly. We had prepared that statement not for publication, but some weeks after we sent it to the Department of State the President released it to the public with his approval. Our delegation included five members, all of whom had legislative experience, Mr. Merrow, of New Hampshire, and myself, representing the House, Senator Pastore representing the Senate, a former Member of the House, Colgate W. Darden, of Virginia, and Henry Cabot Lodge. Our statement pointed out that the Soviets are shifting from military threats to an economic emphasis and that to meet it we must prove what we have proved in the past, our superiority in this field. We ought to welcome that shift. The question is, however, Shall we in changing our policy in order to meet a new threat, weaken ourselves in the military field? If the Communists find that we are weak now, where they have not conquered, they will move back into the military field and press for advantages all over the world.

Senator Vandenberg said one time that it will not help a man in a 20-foot well to throw him a 15-foot rope. And, that applies to this situation. It is better to err on the side of the larger amount than to go in the other direction. I have praised the chairman and other members of our committee for trying to find a place to save money, and that is something we owe to the tax-burdened people of the country, but let us, in acknowledgment of our grave responsibility, speak frankly to them. How much is our freedom worth? And, if we believe what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] so eloquently said yesterday that the fight continues, then it seems to me that his logic leads to the larger figure.

I ask my friends on the Democratic side—and this is with no taint of partisanship—to remember that when we asked the people of this country to elect a Democratic Congress we assured them we would continue to act responsibly, and I cannot see how we can fulfill that commitment if we turn down a request from the Executive in the field of military operations where the issue is so grave, where the continuing crises demand firm action on our part. On that basis I support this larger amount, and I believe only in so doing will we assure those who are allied with us in this terrific struggle that this is indeed a fight to the finish. Not until the threat is ended will the United States cease to use its resources of every kind, its industrial, its moral, its intellectual resources in a struggle to put down the evil that we know exists in our world.

Mr. Chairman, we are passing through a tunnel. There is light ahead, and we must not permit any rocks to get in our way. I agree that a reevaluation of foreign policy should be made, and I will support such a measure, provided it is a legislative evaluation, for the primary responsibility is ours. But, I submit, that in any altered policy we will not reverse our movements. There may be a departure in this direction or that, but we will not conclude, surely, on the

basis of achievements to date, that there has been anything essentially wrong in our policies of the past, our linking our resources with those who are identified with us in the fight.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY for the amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, strike out "\$1,925,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,425,000,000."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think we are getting all the facts before the committee at the present time. My good friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], whom you just heard speaking so eloquently, has offered an amendment to increase the amount for military aid above the committee figure by a total of \$600 million. The substitute amendment which I have offered would decrease the committee figure for military aid by an additional one-half billion dollars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think if we are willing to support the cut that the committee so wisely made, in my opinion, of \$1 billion, we can find just as much justification for a cut in military aid of \$1.5 billion. In the first place, I think we should all realize that what we are being called upon to decide and consider and deliberate on today is nothing more or less than an interim program. Now, we have had ample testimony, I believe, before the committee, and it has also been said here in the well, that we have in the pipeline, particularly for military aid, sufficient money for at least 2 years.

We have heard a great many of the distinguished gentlemen say, especially yesterday, that we have got to keep the pipeline built up, we have got to keep the goods flowing through the pipeline. Mr. Chairman, 2 years from now, when the present pipeline will expire, we do not know now whether we will then have a pipeline or in which direction it will be going. That will depend upon the results of the review and the reappraisal and the reevaluation which I think we are all agreed upon are necessary. But we do have a 2 years' supply in the pipeline, and, taking that fact and the fact that nobody knows 2 years from now where the pipeline will be going, whether in military aid or economic aid or no aid at all—taking those facts into consideration, I maintain that it is ridiculous to expand the present pipeline, as the administration is asking us to do.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention of the members of the committee to the supplemental views on page 97 of the committee report, signed by myself and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

In the second paragraph we state that—

According to the Joint Committee on Non-essential Federal Expenditures, the program's unexpended balance as of July 1, 1956, will be about \$6.6 billion.

The expenditures which the administration contemplates, the new authorizations which it requests, would result at the end of the next fiscal year in a total of almost \$7 billion, which would



mean a net increase in the pipeline of about \$400 million.

I maintain that that is ridiculous. If we are going to put our emphasis on military aid, then let us come out and say so. If, on the other hand, we are considering a possible shift from emphasis on military aid to emphasis on economic aid; if we are prepared, for example, to try and achieve more peaceable relations with the Soviets, as the exchange of visits of the Air Chiefs of Staff would seem to indicate, as the proposed exchange of visits of the Secretaries of Defense that I read about would seem to indicate, then why this emphasis on military aid? Are we talking peace on the one hand and militarism on the other? That I cannot understand.

I should like the committee to accept a few figures for comparison. These are the figures that the administration has asked for. The figures that the administration wants in this foreign aid program would be six times as much as the Federal Government is currently spending for highways; twice as much as this year's outlay for farm price supports. It would pay the operating expenses of all the regular departments of the Government for almost 3 years. It would come close to the annual cost of veterans' aid and benefits. It is about four times the amount being spent on flood control, reclamation, public power dams and the development of the Tennessee Valley put together. Those estimates are from the December 30 issue of the U. S. News & World Report.

As I say, I think we are all agreed upon the necessity for a review and a reevaluation of this program. I think we have ample funds at the present time to keep this program going during the interim period, during the review period. But I maintain that it does not make sense—at least to me—to increase this program, as we are being asked to do—nearly twice the amount that we appropriated last year—when we are going to be considering the direction in which the program should be going. We do not even know whether the emphasis is going to be on military aid or not.

I strongly urge the committee to adopt my substitute amendment. I do not believe it will cripple the program. I believe the program has ample funds to keep it going for the necessary time. I think that the \$1.5 billion cut can be amply justified.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. Chairman, first I want to say, not facetiously, that I hope the reporters and others will get it clear that it is my good friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] who is sponsoring this increase and not HAYS of Ohio.

I think this is the first time in the seven and a half years I have been in Congress that I have come down in this well opposing any sum of money, even as much as a dollar, for foreign aid, but I certainly think the committee was justified in the cut it made, and I think it would be an error if we increased that amount here on the floor.

The committee held hearings for, I am sure it must have been all of 2 months, and there were many, many, executive sessions, and this matter was pretty thoroughly thrashed out in committee. We had much more information than we can possibly get here on the floor.

I think the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas made one point which probably ought to defeat his amendment, if nothing else, and that is, he said that the Soviets are shifting from the threat of war to economic penetration. And what do we propose to do? We propose to meet that by increasing the military appropriation.

Most of the free nations of the world are more interested in strengthening their economic foundations at the present time than they are in having more weapons which may be antiquated and outmoded by the time, if the time ever comes, that it is necessary for them to use them. So what do we propose to do? We propose to put guns into the hands of people that do not have enough food in their stomachs, and then we propose to close our eyes and say that they will be on our side when the showdown comes. I do not know how much more you can delude yourself than that, but it seems to me that is going pretty far.

The people on my left need not listen to this, but I should like to talk a little political sense to my friends on my right. Much is being made of the fact that the President wants this cut restored, but if you have half as much imagination as I have, you can see his face on the television this fall, with that famous Eisenhower smile, saying, "Give me a Republican Congress to put through the legislation I want." But do not forget that the cut we are proposing to restore came from his own side of the House. I heard him say it in 1954, after I had been down in the well defending his program a half dozen times. So if there is any political value in the thing, you had better think it over a couple of times before you think you are on the right side politically, if there is any political merit in this.

I would ask you another thing. I would ask you to check your mail. If you can find a single letter in the mail that has come in asking you to raise this amount, any of you, I would appreciate your bringing it around, because I have gone over my mail thoroughly, and I cannot find the first one, but I can find plenty of them asking us to go slow and be modest and be moderate.

They talk about filling the pipeline. The military testified that the pipeline is full for 2 years. If you can believe half the propaganda the Pentagon puts out, they are going to have so many new revolutionary weapons they say they cannot even talk about coming into effect 2 years from now that anything they are going to order now will be obsolete.

I just wonder how the military can say, "Well, last year \$3 billion plus was enough, but for 2 years from now we are going to need \$5 billion," when they say and the proponent of the amendment says that the trend is away from the military to the economic. There is some twisted logic in there somewhere.

I just want to tell you something else. I do not know. This came up to our com-

mittee as unclassified information. Somebody has probably classified it by now. In all the voluminous stuff they sent up we found the sum of \$75,000 to set up the beginnings of military assistance groups in two Arab countries that do not have them now. Get that. Pay attention to that. Military assistance groups to two Arab countries in the Near East. Somebody on the committee staff caught that, and the Pentagon was queried. This will shock you, I think. Do you know what the Pentagon said? "We don't know how that got in there. That was a mistake."

The Pentagon said, "That money for those two Arab nations was a mistake. We do not know how it got in there."

Now, did any of you ever send anybody a check for \$3,000 for an automobile that you did not buy and when the agency called you up and asked you about it say it was a mistake? I know I never did.

I was talking only on Monday of this week to General Gruenther, and he was asking me to do what I could to restore this cut. I told him he was talking to the wrong person. I said I am opposing any more money than what the committee reported out. In other words, I am standing for the cut. I said, "One of the reasons I am standing for it is because the Pentagon does not level with the Congress." Do you know what his answer was? He said, "I cannot defend the Pentagon system of bookkeeping." I think General Gruenther is a great general. I consider him a friend of mine. I am sorry I cannot go along with his request, but I think it was significant when he said, "I cannot defend the Pentagon system of bookkeeping." Who in the name of heaven can defend it? Yet the Pentagon, who can make a mistake by proposing to send money to two Arab countries in which we have never had military-assistance groups, and I hope we never will, if they can make that kind of mistake do we need to say that they are infallible, when they say they need six or seven hundred million more than the committee proposes to give them? That is the fundamental question. In spite of all the speeches you will hear pro and con about it, that still remains the fundamental question. Can they effectively use the money, and what do they propose, effectively, to do with it, and should we give them an increased amount when it is said the shift is to economic problems?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has again expired.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I voted in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to report H. R. 11356, and I will support the measure in passage through the House. The decision to do so has not been an easy one in spite of the substantial cuts in the authorization made in committee. However, and on balance, I see no constructive alternative to support of the measure at this

time if military and economic chaos is to be averted in a dozen lands. I do feel, however, that I would be remiss if I did not at this time make certain observations relative to the subject of our international efforts to assist others.

My principal concern with the general subject of foreign aid is not related to its dollar magnitude, but to its announced purposes and to the failure of the program to achieve the ends for which it was originally designed. The peace of the world and the welfare of those peoples allied with us in an effort to resist the cruel domination of the Soviet rulers cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents, and any effort to relate freedom to the capacity of the United States Treasury is bound to bring frustration and confusion to the debate upon and the implementation of any program.

Friendship in its highest expression connotes a sincere regard both as between individuals and nations alike. Inherent in friendship is a mutual purpose tenaciously pursued, together with a common regard for certain principles in life. In our own national history this mutuality was best expressed by the framers of the Constitution who, with but a single purpose and out of dissension and bitter controversy, welded together the individual parts of the Constitution into a coherent and magnificent whole.

In the world of today as it is affected by the impact of our assistance efforts, military and economic, there exists in large part dissension and controversy, unleavened by the common purpose save as the law of self-preservation operates as an expediency. Into this conflict of national interests—into a vacuum of selfish concern—this Nation has poured billions of dollars, sometimes wisely and, on many occasions, injudiciously, in an effort to compound an amalgam of spirit, international in form, dedicated to collective effort and to the security of that portion of the earth outside the orbit of Soviet influence.

The tragic truth attendant on our efforts is that only a few of the many peoples we have attempted to aid have returned our investment with the currency of good will and cooperation. In other quarters we have been repaid with invective, envy, and the sullen disquietude that has always marked the relationships between the eager giver and the reluctant receiver.

Further, our course of action has been one which has served to confuse our own people and those abroad. We have not well distinguished between proven friends and those who have given every indication of a neutrality benevolent to our only possible foe. For many years we have stressed that the granting of assistance to any nation did not carry with it the requirement that a nation need necessarily adopt or even approve the American system of free, legal, and competitive enterprise. I do not accord with the idea inherent in our aid programs, that we can make America stronger by lending aid to socialism abroad, but this we have done and continue to do throughout the world. We have relaxed our insistence that allies receiving aid under the provisions of the

Mutual Security Act refrain from trading with the enemy, on the plea that the economies of the countries concerned are dependent, in large part, upon the market places of the Soviet world. We may expect to hear more on this score when the advocates of admission of Red China to the United Nations become more voluble on the subject than they dare to be at present.

Bookkeeping procedures in the MSA have become so involved that a mathematician of the keenest intellect cannot burrow through the maze of figures to arrive at the truth relative to pipeline deliveries, offshore procurement, infrastructure, lead time, carryover, and many another complex phase of the operations. The Comptroller General of the United States literally admitted the inability of the General Accounting Office to keep pace with MSA fiscal matters, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations 2 weeks ago. What is the average Member of the House or of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do in a situation which is so vast and confused that the trained accountants in GAO cannot keep pace with the past, current, and proposed expenditures?

It is contended that military aid to foreign countries is an integral part of our own defense activities. If the program is to be justified before the people of this country, this must necessarily be the case. Many of us believe, and the majority report expresses the wishful hope, that military funds provided in MSA appropriations in future years will be included in the Defense Establishment budget. In that way, and only in that way, can the various remaining items be properly titled and considered by the Congress. However, those who vote against H. R. 11356 will, in effect, say to Turkey, Korea, the Republic of China on Taiwan, Spain, and others who have brought determination to the fight, that we propose to leave them to the mercies of our mutual enemies. This is the unfortunate aspect of the choice each Member must make. Can we afford to relinquish all military and economic interest in the Republics of Latin America? Granted that some of our allies have brought no spirit of determination to the global conflict, can we afford to let the willing and determined fall prey together with those of little or no stomach for a possible conflict?

I have weighed the matter carefully in my own mind and have reached the conclusion that I have no alternative but to support the measure now before us. The consequences to be reckoned are too great to be lightly considered. However, the Congress can and must look to the future of the program and bring to our assistance effort a degree of realism heretofore sadly lacking. We cannot, for an unpredictable number of years, continue to underwrite the national experiments in global socialism now being undertaken in many lands. As the Socialist theories in practice sap the productive capacity of a people, so does socialism sap the national will to rise to unforeseen emergencies and dangers.

We should expand our efforts within the Western Hemisphere to the end that

those nations which are cast with us in a common geographic mold may be enabled better to resist the lures of the Soviet Union. The red flames of Communist aggression were checked in Guatemala before they could spread to other republics, but we should not await the sound of crackling flames elsewhere in our hemisphere before reaching for the extinguishers. The provision of \$5 million in additional aid for Guatemala is constructive and designed to indicate to the people of that country that not only are we concerned with the blaze until such time as it has been extinguished, but that our friendship continues through the burdened period of reconstruction.

The so-called neutrals—those nations who appear ready and willing to play off the aid of one country against the promises of another—should be promptly informed that the United States does not intend to be one of the pawns in an international chess game, where the Soviet holds the major pieces. Nationalism, neutralism and diplomatic guile are poor offerings to bring to the table of collective security.

H. R. 11356 should be passed; not because of its defects, but in spite of them. The world and its peoples, friends and foes alike, will interpret the vote on this measure as an indication of the collective thinking of the American people in the era of the Khrushchev-Bulganin smiles. Circumstances have combined to force many to vote for a measure which may well create new envy, new indecision, new hatreds, and new problems. But it will serve to indicate no letdown on the part of the American Congress in our true allies or in the assessment by the Congress of the new Soviet tactics.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hays amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom that I come into this well, but I feel so deeply on this subject I have to say something in defense of our chairman and in opposition to the pending amendment. I am not a lawyer, but I believe I am a pretty good bookkeeper. I have supported foreign aid and mutual security for years before I came to Congress. I made speeches all over my district for it. If I thought that cutting this bill, as the committee did, would in any way jeopardize the defense of this country, I would not rise in opposition to the Hays amendment. But after listening to these hearings for 2 months, after studying the testimony of all of the witnesses, I can tell you truthfully that this cut of \$1 billion will not jeopardize the defense of our country one single dime. To restore this cut is a direct repudiation of one of the finest men I have ever known.

DICK RICHARDS has fought for this program over the years. He has been a Member of the House for a quarter of a century. Ever since mutual security started, he has fought for this program, both in Republican and Democratic administrations. So far as his knowledge of the program is concerned, and so far as knowing where this money goes or whether they need it or not is concerned, in my opinion, he knows more about it than even the President of the United



States, because his information comes to him from other people.

Recently we voted \$34 billion for the Defense Department. They have \$6 billion in the pipeline and approximately \$3 billion more in this bill. I cannot understand why we want to add more money to this program when the farmers all over the Nation are going broke, when small business is going broke, when taxes have reached the saturation point, when even the administration itself admits that a new study has to be made of this program.

You have heard much of what the Comptroller General said. Here is just one statement in reference to what he said before the Foreign Affairs Committee:

Comptroller General Campbell told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over-optimistic foreign-aid planning has resulted in appropriation of more money than could be spent.

One result, he said, is that the Defense Department is holding at least \$400 million in foreign-aid funds in violation of the law. That money, Campbell said, should revert to the Treasury.

"Two main factors," Campbell said, "contribute to 'overprogramming' foreign aid." He said the International Cooperation Administration "apparently does not consider realistically the available resources and capabilities of both the United States and individual recipient countries." He also said "there is sometimes a preponderance of political over economic and financial considerations in determining the level of country programs."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And the Comptroller General in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that this represented unpaid obligations, overstated as of June 30, 1954. Does the gentleman know whether this \$400 million is still being held by the Pentagon?

Mr. PILCHER. No; I do not.

Mr. GROSS. This money is held in violation of the law. I should like to hear someone here today tell us whether this \$400 million is still being held by the Pentagon in violation of the law.

Mr. PILCHER. Well, if this cut is restored, it is going to put a good many Members like myself in a position of having to vote against the entire bill. That is something I did not think I would ever see, but I cannot conscientiously go back to my people, with the condition they are in, and appropriate more money, I know, than they can spend or need to spend.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hays amendment and speak for the amount of the bill for foreign military aid as the Foreign Affairs Committee has reported it.

I disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], as I believe that we have looked this bill over thoroughly in committee. The committee by a vote of 24 to 4 reported out this bill in this amount after 6 weeks of thorough hearings. That is the first point.

Secondly, as to \$1 billion of the proposed cut of \$1,109,000,000 in the Foreign

Affairs Committee, it was my amendment, which certainly places on me as well as the other members, a real responsibility to justify our action to this House. I have certainly tried to keep my amendment out of politics, and have even gone so far as to not make the original announcement but requested the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], who supported the amendment, to make the announcement. So, I disagree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] who would like to make it possibly a matter of political capital or to have some effect upon the coming election in November. Politics should not be any consideration whatever when the security of our country is involved.

This amendment has been bipartisan in origination. It was sponsored by myself originally and was adopted by the committee, but there were other amendments proposed by members seeking to cut the proposal by various amounts. So, this has been a committee action rather than an individual or a political or partisan action.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I dislike very much to interrupt, but the gentleman from Arkansas made the statement that since 1947 the Communists had not been successful in their aggression. He forgets Indochina. More Indonesians vote Communist than any country outside of the Iron Curtain countries. He forgets what is happening in Egypt. And I just wanted to correct that statement, because the gentleman is simply mistaken.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If I did not say in Europe, I intended to.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman did say in Europe.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman does not want to give the impression that the committee voted 24 to 4 for this cut of \$1 billion. That vote was 18 to 11. We all voted 24 to 4 to report the bill out in the form it was in in the hope we could amend it and increase the amount. But, the vote to cut was 18 to 11. Is that not correct?

Mr. FULTON. Yes, that is right. The committee, by a vote of 24 to 4 adopted this amount in voting to report, in order to get the bill to the floor, although the original vote was 18 to 11 on the amendment as amended.

The serious question comes, Why did we make the cut? We made the cut because we thought the proposed amounts would be wasting money, unless a thorough resurvey of the foreign aid program be made in the light of fast changing world conditions. I cannot tell you the procedure, because it is secret, but this cut reduces the proposal to approxi-

mately the amount that was originally requested by this agency for this fiscal year; and the figure was later increased.

We should not speak of this as a cut because last year the appropriation for this foreign aid was \$2,730 million. This year the Foreign Affairs Committee is increasing the amount in this program by approximately \$800 million. Even with my cut of \$1 billion in this bill there is approximately \$3,500 million of new funds for fiscal 1957 for the foreign aid program. That means that the committee is actually increasing the program \$800 million for the coming year. I feel there is some increase due. But how can the people who propose a further increase, such as my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], reconcile that with the fact that the Secretary of State and the President now say that our foreign affairs are in much better condition this year than they were last, and each succeeding year in this administration they have been better; but now all of a sudden the International Cooperation Agency wants a \$2 billion increase in the foreign aid program over last year, largely for military items?

We on the committee have felt that this program is long overdue for a thorough resurvey and reexamination. My position is this. I admire Gen. Al Gruenther very much. I have full confidence in him. I want NATO kept. I would not in the least hurt it. But we should be careful of getting the reputation of throwing money loosely around this world. It hurts the program. When the administration resurvey has been made, there is ample time to request Congress for further consideration, and I certainly promise my full cooperation.

When we cut previously, this House sustained the committee in spite of dire predictions that we were ruining the country and that world affairs would be pulled down around our heads, this program has developed and developed comparatively well.

Let us look at the items in this \$1 billion cut. First there is \$400 million concerning which testimony was had before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from the Comptroller General of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Comptroller General of the United States Campbell, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body, said that \$400 million of these funds should be returned to the United States Treasury as these funds held over from previous years, were being held illegally by this Agency, the International Cooperation Agency. In addition, there is no question—and I can say it, I believe, without any fear of contradiction—that there is \$190 million that is held over from the current 1956 fiscal year that is not even planned for

or obligated. The Agency could not reasonably find a program to put it in, so they had that amount left over, and are to be congratulated for saying so.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, a year or so ago the Committee on Appropriations came up with evidence of faulty bookkeeping. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], said here yesterday that they turned up \$500 million as an item of faulty bookkeeping in the Department of Defense. Yes, and last year we on the Committee on Foreign Affairs heard the Department of Defense say to us that there was \$145 million in a kitty that the Department had simply held in this foreign-aid program as a revolving fund. It was my amendment that cut that \$145 million out. The committee adopted it and this House sustained that cut, even though the other body had already approved a higher amount.

Mr. Chairman, if you will recall, in previous years we on the committee have likewise cut this bill and it has not hurt. For example, in 1952, May 21, here on the floor I said:

We on the Foreign Affairs Committee have already cut the administration's figure by \$998,900,000 for foreign aid.

That was under Harry Truman. But what do we do when the Presidents themselves disagree? For example, Harry Truman stated he wanted \$7,600,000,000 for the next fiscal year for foreign aid in his request just before President Eisenhower took office.

President Eisenhower came in and reduced the request for the first fiscal year in his term by \$1,772,000,000 to a figure of \$5,828,000,000. We on the committee then asked the Mutual Security Administration under Stassen to explain this proposal to us; many of us on the committee felt even that figure was high. Stassen himself voluntarily cut out \$354 million and we on the committee again cut the request. The committee that year adopted 3 of my amendments of \$100 million apiece, totaling \$300 million, so we have respected our responsibility to the United States taxpayers in our deliberations on the Foreign Affairs Committee. We on the committee that year cut the proposal \$476 million on top of Stassen's cut.

We say to you that we on the House Foreign Affairs Committee have examined and worked with this program. We have supported it. This is the eighth year that I have argued for this program, beginning with the Marshall plan. We have investigated these countries. We have looked at it in detail. When we say to you, "Resurvey this program for the next 6 or 7 months," and to the administration, "Come back here in January after a resurvey and we will hear further your request for the money," that is not asking very much. As the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], the chairman of the committee, has said, at this moment in the foreign-aid pipelines there is enough money to run this program for 2½ years without another cent being added.

I urge the House to sustain the Foreign Affairs Committee in its decision on this legislation, and I heartily support our chairman, the gentleman from

South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] in his stand for the cut of \$1,109,000,000 in the proposal, pending a resurvey and re-evaluation of the United States foreign-aid programs abroad.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD to the amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, after "exceed", strike out "\$1,925,000,000" and insert "\$2,925,000,000"; and on page 2, line 4, strike out "\$402,000,000" and insert "\$589,500,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, not long ago a great and distinguished American said that politics should end at the water's edge. I believe, having had my friends to the right encourage my friends to the left in my presence here during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations to believe this, that it is only fair under these circumstances that I join with my friends on the right in asking you on the left to do it today, and at the same time ask my friends on the left to join with me in asking my friends on the right to see how consistent both sides can all be after the last 8 years of discussing these foreign aid bills. Just where do both of you stand? My amendment gives you the opportunity to see how much you value the jewel of consistency on this program.

I have listened to my very dear friend from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] and I agree with everything he said up to the point of his amendment, and for precisely his argument. This cut as requested by the committee cannot be supported and for precisely those reasons the President's request should be met by the House.

Several speakers here today and yesterday want to do this in dribs and drabs, take a little bit here and a little bit there.

Not long ago in one of these historic and classic debates on the farm bill—God save the mark, at least this is not the farm bill—one of my farmer friends told us about the farmer and his cow. The cow was eating too much hay and the farmer decided he would teach the cow not to be so expensive, so he reduced the hay for the cow day by day, year by year. Finally he had the cow down to a couple of handfuls of hay a day, just as you are doing, or want to do. Well, it worked out very well. He had a very economical cow, but the cow died.

Now you want to cut this established program at a period of time when you say the world is in danger and you baste your breath to tell me how evil the world is. There is no sign that military tension is lessening, none at all. Quite the contrary. My friends to the right say, despite what my friends to the left say, "There is no peace in the world." Well, if there is no peace in the world, in Formosa, in Vietnam, in the Middle East,

if all the things you say are true, then how can you touch military aid to Pakistan, military aid to Laos and Cambodia and Turkey? How can you do that? How can you touch military aid if you say there is no peace in the world? You cannot blow hot and cold in the coming campaign or out of it. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot vote to cut military aid and then go to this campaign and say, "These fellows are wrong. The world is not at peace." Remember the record will show that vote.

As for you to the left—well, well, well. I stand here asking you to back your President.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I cannot yield just now. I stand here asking you to follow the great general, the recognized expert on military affairs. As a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee, I stood in the well of this House and went the limit and more to back your President on military and defense matters. I asked you to give more for B-52 bombers. I told you what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said. I told you what the Joint Chiefs of Staff said. I told you what the Secretary of State said. Now I come here and I give to you the plea, I give to you the request, I give to you the sincerity, ability, skill, and leadership of General Eisenhower and of President Eisenhower, in this field. Do you dare substitute, in view of what you have said—do you dare to substitute your unskilled opinion in view of what you say to us this day for purposes other than the welfare of the Nation, for purposes other than the opinion of your leader, our President, do you dare cut in military and economic aid to the request of the President of the United States who, by the Constitution, sets and leads our foreign policy?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will not.

If I am the only man in this House who votes to support the President of the United States under these circumstances at this time on the foreign-aid bill, I will cast that vote. I see no reason why you can substitute one opinion for another. They tell me that there are deodorants of various kinds, but they have nothing to cure halitosis. They merely substitute one odor for another.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. If I can get more time, I will yield interminably.

Mr. GROSS. Right now?

Mr. FLOOD. Not at this time.

Now I say, Mr. Chairman, that when I defended the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense I said I would support the President's request in the foreign-aid bill for military and economic aid. What you are doing if you support a cut, you are in effect cutting billions out of the defense budget, in ratio, under this act. Nobody in this House would cut the defense appropriation bill \$10 billion. You are doing that here. The reason the defense appropriation bill was not billions more than it was, the reason we did not have a bigger bill for defense, is because of



the President's military-aid program—the this program.

Now what do you do? Do you want to cut 6 inches off the bottom of a blanket and sew it on the top because the blanket is not long enough? You cannot have it both ways. You refused to increase the defense appropriation bill. Now you want to cut this one. Yet I have it, upon the authority of the President who leads foreign policy, I have it upon the authority of General Gruenther who now leads NATO, I have it upon the authority of General Eisenhower who established NATO, that this bill is necessary as he brings it up, necessary to the national security, the general welfare, and safety of this Nation. And do I understand that this House in 1956, after only 6 weeks of hearings, will deny the President and his military advisers, and I love my friend from South Carolina, I served when I first came to the House on his committee, and whatever knowledge or skill or awareness I have of the subject I learned at his feet, and my heart is heavy with yours when he leaves us this year. But even he could be wrong; even I could be wrong. But I am not wrong this time, that is the difference.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FLOOD. That is a good time to ask me to yield. Even I must yield at that point.

Mr. FULTON. In the gentleman's figure there is, of course, military aid for Yugoslavia. What does the gentleman think our Italian friends think of building up further military establishments in Yugoslavia, their jet-plane program, giving them one of the largest jet-plane squadrons in the world? Is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. FLOOD. I suggest the gentleman address that question to our Italian friends, not to me.

Mr. FULTON. It is in the gentleman's amendment. I wonder how the gentleman felt about it.

Mr. FLOOD. I love my Italian friends; I have thousands of them in my district.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. If I am not mistaken there is going to be an opportunity later in our action on this bill to meet this Yugoslav question.

Mr. FLOOD. There will be, and there will be an opportunity later when we come to page 3. I propose to offer an amendment to restore the cut, \$100 million, to give the President the right to use his discretion in the exercise of this fund for the Middle East, Africa, and Asia.

Mr. Chairman, on May 25 last the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported out H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956, which authorized the appropriation of funds to carry forward the program during the fiscal year 1957. The report of the committee contains some very interesting language and some conclusions which I believe to be unwarranted.

The committee reported:

This is a bill to implement the foreign policy of the United States.

It said further that all of the mutual security programs "are designed to promote the security of the United States and of the free world." In addition the committee said that "we should continue the program and strive continually to improve it."

For these very same reasons the President had recommended the appropriation of \$4.8 billion of new funds and a carryover of old funds to make a total mutual security program of \$4.9 billion for the fiscal year 1957.

Of this nearly \$5 billion, \$3 billion was for mutual defense assistance in the President's request. Mutual defense assistance is usually referred to as military aid. It consists mainly of weapons and training which are supplied to our military allies and partners. The Committee on Foreign Affairs said: "The sums authorized in this bill for military purposes are for the defense of the United States" and yet it cut the President's request for military aid by one-third.

Nobody in this Chamber would think of cutting 30 percent out of our domestic defense budget—of reducing defense appropriations by more than \$10 billion—and yet such a meat-axe approach has been taken in that part of the United States military program which is concerned with other nations.

Everyone who has studied the subject of military assistance, so-called, has come to the conclusion that this is one of the most effective, cheapest, and best ways to advance the interests of the United States in military security.

We all know that there are various strategic spots around the world which must be held if the United States is to be secure. Do we serve our country better by drafting American boys to hold these spots or do we serve it better by helping other freedom-loving people to defend their own soil, and in defending it, to defend us, too?

Does anyone think the military threat to the United States and its partners has departed? Has the capacity of the Soviet or the Chinese Communists to launch an aggression diminished?

There is talk of sweetness and light from Khrushchev and Bulganin and we hear reports of alleged cuts in the Soviet military machine. Even should the reported cuts in manpower prove true, this does not mean that the capacity of the Soviet machine, or the firepower it can bring to bear, has gone down one bit.

We have been told in our own country that it is possible to get a "bigger bang for a buck," that with reduction in the numbers of our Armed Forces, we are actually stronger than ever. I take it the same reasoning can be applied to the Sino-Soviet bloc and that, even with less manpower, they are able to produce "more rubble per ruble."

I have heard it said that the President's request for military assistance funds should not be granted in full because there is a vast backlog of unexpended funds. I would remind the Members of this House that the backlog of unexpended funds for military assistance is at the lowest point in recent years. I would remind them, also, that a worldwide cooperative military program involving scores of sovereign na-

tions cannot work if one partner tries to turn it on or off like a garden hose.

Decisions on the levels of Armed Forces needed to defend strategic locations, decisions on what it takes to equip and maintain those forces, decisions on how the bills are to be paid, decisions as to what the United States will do, decisions on committing military-assistance funds—in other words, ordering the necessary equipment, waiting for it to be produced, and then seeing that it is delivered to our allies—and then training allied forces in its effective use—this is a vast and complicated process and one that involves a great deal of time.

I mention the element of time because a stop-start approach or a slowdown approach to mutual security means that we have to use more time to get less results than if we were to go along with the President's request. I do not think we can afford the time nor do I think that we can afford, through inaction on our part, to weaken the free world military alliance which has been successful, for 6 years, in deterring new military aggression by Communist forces.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended that slightly less than \$2 billion be appropriated, of which not less than \$48 million shall be available only for Spain and not more than \$402 million for military assistance to other European countries.

What would such a cut mean, especially to Europe—an area which the Secretary of State has characterized as so important to United States security that we even have United States troops stationed there?

If funds available for our NATO allies in Europe amount to only \$402 million, and were used entirely to make up losses through attrition, to pay for spare parts and maintenance, not even these needs could be met. Even worse, there could be no progress on a program for advanced weapons, a program which is considered to be important not only for reasons of military tactics, but also for psychological and political reasons.

Furthermore, if the funds for Europe were expended entirely for advanced weapons, there could be no upkeep on the immense investment already made in European defenses by the United States.

If the presently authorized funds were divided between the advanced weapons program and the maintenance program, neither program could advance and both would suffer.

We are told that some of our European friends hold an erroneous belief that the Soviet military threat has ended. Should we encourage them in that belief by cutting down the military program for Europe to the point where it cannot operate? Are we trying to hold the NATO alliance together, or to help it disintegrate?

Other countries for whom a major share of the military assistance funds are programed include Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Pakistan, and Turkey—each of them within clawing distance of the Dragon or the Bear. Are we in the business of encouraging individual weakness or are we trying to create collective strength? If we are trying to do the latter, I confess I cannot

see how countries whose military strength depends upon arms and equipment from the United States can become stronger if the funds to pay for such arms are cut down by one-third.

The facts are that our worldwide expenditures in recent years for military assistance have been larger than appropriations. We have been depleting the reservoir of military aid faster than we have been filling it up.

Cuts can be made—there is no question about that. The question is, what will be the effect? Let us not forget the fable of the man who thought his cow was eating too much and, in an effort to save money, started cutting down on the cow's food. Every day he gave the cow a little less to eat. Eventually, he was successful; he got the cow down to two wisps of hay per day. The success of this experiment in economy was somewhat eclipsed by the fact that when the cow got down to this money-saving ration, the creature died.

The other major cut in the President's request is a cut of \$100 million in economic funds available for the Middle East. The President had originally proposed a special fund of this amount for the area.

The committee consolidated the program of development assistance, the President's fund for Asian economic development, and the special fund which had been requested by the President for the Middle East. There can be no objection to the consolidation of the various funds, but are we wise in cutting down the amount available for the Middle East by \$100 million?

Here, in this area, according to all newspaper accounts, is the most volatile situation to be found anywhere in the world. Here the Soviet bloc is making a major effort of a nonmilitary character. Here the situation changes rapidly, and it is here that emergencies may arise or opportunities may come up which require fast and flexible action if advantage is to accrue to our side and not to the Soviet bloc.

The President had requested another string to his bow to help him carry out his constitutional responsibilities in respect to the foreign relations of the United States. By denying the President the \$100 million for the Middle East, the committee has, in effect, denied him this extra bowstring.

Not only did the committee deprive the President of funds he had requested, but it also deprived him of an element of flexibility in the use of funds by requiring that all development-assistance funds be made available to other nations either in the form of loans or in the form of United States surplus agricultural commodities.

These mandatory provisions apply to the Middle East. Where the maximum discretion should be left to the President, should we tie his hands with inflexible legal provisions?

Where speed can be a decisive factor, should we guarantee that the United States cannot act with speed because of the need for lengthy negotiation about terms of loans or use of United States surplus products?

Mr. Chairman, I believe the interests of the United States will be promoted more effectively—and over the long run at less cost to the taxpayers—if we give to the President the funds he has asked for and do not burden him with legal provisions which hinder his ability—his duty—to act fast when fast action is required to protect the security of our country.

Mr. VORYS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] rise?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hays amendment and against all the rest of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, when I first heard that this bill provided over \$2 billion more for military aid than we had last year, I started to study how it could be cut. I think I have the best attendance record at the hearings of our committee of any member of the committee except possibly our great chairman. I am supporting the Hays amendment, and I am against all the rest of the amendments because I feel quite confident that the executive branch can live with the Hays amendment but will be in trouble with any of the rest of them.

As to the Flood amendment, for instance, it has been found by the Defense Department that there is \$129 million of savings that can be made in the authorization. That is reflected in the request to the Appropriations Committee now.

As to the \$400 million that the Comptroller General said was illegally held over in June 1954, I understand he has not yet furnished supporting data to the Defense Department. Far more than that has been taken out of the Defense Department appropriations since then, not only by action of the Budget but by action of the Congress since then.

I had this chart brought in because it shows the way the appropriations have been going, where they took a great big dip here and the way the expenditures have been going.

We have made a reduction since 1953 in the annual expenditures. Remember, this is "part and parcel of our own defense," according to Admiral Radford and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. A lot of people think we are cutting our own defense expenditures too low, but in any case this administration has tried to hold down defense expenditures at home and abroad, and has done pretty well. We still need, however, a pipeline of expenditures in excess of \$2.5 billion a year to supply and maintain this program. But when we made the cut of nearly \$600 million last year we put a dent in the pipeline, and it was not because the Congress said the program requested was bad but because Congress wanted to punish the Defense Department for inaccurate bookkeeping. We made this \$600 million dent in the flow of the long lead items needed to keep this defense program going. This had to be added this year. Then when it was determined that we were to launch a program of \$530 million for advanced

weapons—those are nuclear weapons we are talking about for this program—why, of course, that made an increase for this year.

So I went over the figures they proposed this year, as carefully as I could.

It is not \$6 billion, it is \$5 billion estimated to be unexpended by June 30. All but \$195 million is obligated, programmed, reserved, tied up in this program for various places all over the world. We have gone over the secret books telling where all this is to go; \$374 million of the program is for direct forces support. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] said that we give them guns, but nothing to feed them. There is food money in direct forces support, for the forces in Korea, Formosa, and Vietnam, for food, uniforms and that sort of thing. As I shall explain, that cannot be cut.

I got in touch with the Defense Department when there were talks of cuts. I asked, "Where would you apply the cuts?" They said, "Of course, cuts of the size you are talking about would require 5 or 6 months of reprogramming to figure accurately. We would have to go over the whole program in detail." However, they made the best estimates they could in the time available.

These are some figures they gave: \$255 million are for fixed charges, for shipping for our committed share of infrastructure for the costs of our military advisory groups in each country for some programs that cannot be discussed fully on the floor.

Even with a \$1 billion cut, direct forces support of \$374 million, would not be cut.

Here is the difference between the effect of a \$500 million cut and a billion dollar cut. Every one of these following items would be reduced by a \$500 million cut, but an additional cut of \$500 million would eliminate:

Seventy-five million dollars in spare parts to keep the equipment moving that we have already furnished;

Fifty million dollars in ammunition, for training and a war reserve;

Fifty-two million dollars in naval aircraft;

Ninety million dollars in naval vessels; and

Twenty-six million dollars in other materials.

Two hundred million dollars in advance weapons. That is the program that is so vital in an era of nuclear warfare where we have various sizes of nuclear weapons.

Even with a billion dollar cut training money is cut only \$7 million because of its vital importance to get these forces all over the world trained in the use of our equipment and in our methods.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it fair to say that regardless of the appropriation requested, the expenditure figure, which is really the guiding figure, is only \$500 million more in fiscal 1957 than in the current fiscal year?

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it also fair to say that \$500 million is just about the



amount that is allocated to the new advance weapons program which is considered so vital from the standpoint of the defense of the free world?

Mr. VORYS. That is right. We need more than \$2½ billion a year to keep this going. If we try to ride it out with what we have, we will have nothing for long lead items 2 years from now for advance weapons which we will not be able to procure even if we start now.

I have given an estimate of the weapons that will be cut, unless we restore at least \$500 million. I have not attempted to determine the countries that will be cut. The Defense Department has not done so. Those who vote for the cuts should realize that cuts will have to be taken off somewhere.

Where are you going to take off the billion dollars you are talking about?

For Europe there is requested \$760 million. It is said, well, we can cut a lot in Europe. You are going to have to cut there even with the Hays amendment.

The Near East request is \$471 million. Are you going to cut Greece, Turkey, the northern tier of countries, that are holding the line to the south of Russia? Asia is in here for \$1,066,000,000. Are you going to cut the forces of Korea facing the Communist build-up across the armistice line? They have 20 divisions in their army, the same as we have. Are you going to cut the forces in Formosa, and on Quemoy and Matsu? Are you going to cut the forces in Vietnam, or in Japan? Here are 4 places where peace exists merely by a cease-fire, and an uneasy cease-fire in every case. Are you going to let those Asians down? If you are going to make any of these cuts, you will have to take out part of the military money for these countries.

It will take months to refigure the final impact of any cut. I am relying on Admiral Radford, who knows something about it. Above all, on this program I am relying on a man who has been in this business, President Eisenhower. Since he led our forces to victory in World War II, he has been back over to Europe. He does not have the advantage that somebody has suggested of never having been abroad. He has been over there. He sat there in SHAPE headquarters and waited for weapons that the United States promised but did not ship. On some questions you can say, "Well, the President is ill advised; he does not know about it." But, we are talking about an old soldier who has served abroad in the mutual security program and who says we have got to have this as part and parcel of our own defense. Only 3 of you voted against the military construction bill, which includes \$780 million for overseas bases. Not a soul of you voted against our own defense bill, and we did not cut that at all. We make a great mistake when we attempt to be experts and fly in the face of the man who knows what he is talking about on this program more than anybody here. He has studied this, he knows and he says we need this for our security. So, I am supporting the Hays amendment and I am against the others.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us how much the United States is contributing to the French to carry on their war in North Africa?

Mr. VORYS. Nothing.

Mr. GROSS. Nothing?

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how much of a cut he suggested in this bill, or did he suggest any cut to it at any time?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. Half a billion in committee, and I am supporting this cut, which is a \$400 million cut, because I think that cut can be handled based on the studies I have made, I have tried not to shoot in the dark, not to just make general estimates but to try to figure where we are coming out on this.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman spoke of a breakdown of figures. Where in the committee hearings—and I have tried to go over them carefully—are those figures?

Mr. VORYS. The figures on what the cut would amount to were not in the committee hearing, because the Defense Department was presenting a program that did not involve any cuts. I have sought out and obtained those figures since then. I have put a part of them in the record. But, of course, the figuring on this sort of cut, these gigantic cuts, has not been made in advance.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is no breakdown of your appropriations.

Mr. VORYS. The Defense Department is before the Committee on Appropriations. Let us not forget what we are doing today; we are not appropriating a dime. We are just deciding whether we want to tie our own hands in advance as to what the Committee on Appropriations does. I think we better not tie our hands any tighter than we do with the Hays amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statements of my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], particularly in reference to his most generous and fulsome praise of our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was wondering, when he was praising him, just what he had in mind, whether it was consistent to praise his good friend and distinguished chairman, whom we all love, from one side of his mouth, and from the other side at the same time say that we could not trust him in this instance.

In fact, I am thinking of a story that my good friend from Arkansas loves to tell, one that I am sure most of you have heard, but nevertheless I think very apropos under the circumstances. He tells a story about a man catching a catfish and he puts him up on the table and then he takes a butcher knife, and the catfish begins to wiggle around, and he says, "Now just hold steady, old boy." He says, "I ain't going to do a thing but gut you." I am sure that that is not exactly what my friend had in mind when

he was praising the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]; but it amounts to the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I came to this House the same year the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] came here. I have had the privilege of serving here with him all those years. I wish I had the time, in my own feeble way, to give you my own evaluation of him. But that is not really the point here now. The point is that the gentleman from South Carolina has served 24 years on the Foreign Affairs Committee of this body and has come from the foot of the committee table up to the head of the table, to become the chairman of this great committee.

I doubt that anyone has contributed more to the cause of our international relations than has DICK RICHARDS. It is true that he was not serving in another body where he would have had a better sounding board. Had that been the case I am sure he would now receive the recognition he is so justly entitled to as the outstanding authority on international affairs. But the fact remains that for 24 years he has devoted his time and effort and talents and his good, sound judgment to a study of the controversies that have confronted this great country of ours in a controversial world.

I know what he is up against here. I know what you and I and the rest of us are up against here who subscribe to his recommendations in this matter. We have on the one hand the distinguished gentleman at the other end of the avenue who is asking for a restoration of the funds which he requested. If I understand the situation correctly, we have the leadership on both sides of the aisle in line with that request. It is a rather difficult thing to oppose the White House and the leadership on both sides of the aisle. But that has been one of the characteristics of this man RICHARDS throughout his long service here. Sometimes I like to compare him with another Richard, Richard the Lionhearted—a man who has the courage of his convictions.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I can truthfully repeat for the record here today what I have often said privately. Congressman RICHARDS has few equals and no superiors as a statesman in this House. He is truly a statesman in the proper sense of the word. He is a Democrat in party affiliation, but where the welfare of his country is concerned he is neither Democrat nor Republican. He is a patriotic American first. His conduct during the years of his service in this House has been of the highest order. That conduct here has been in line with his experiences on the battlefields of France defending his country. A high sense of duty, a fervent love of country, and an unwavering devotion to his family and his God have transcended party affiliation and a personal desire for political aggrandizement.

This together with his sound judgment, his fearless courage, and his gentle consideration of his fellow man has all resulted in the high esteem in which he is held on both sides of the aisle of this House.

If the pending amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hays] is defeated and with the great odds under which my distinguished colleague and friend is fighting, with the leadership on both sides and the President of the United States aligned against him, it will be because of the respect and confidence the membership of this House has in the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great compensating factors that I have received as a result of my service in this body was the opportunity to know and be associated rather closely with my colleague from South Carolina. I am sure that I bespeak the sentiment of all when I say that the Congress and the country will suffer tremendously by the voluntary retirement of our friend at the end of this session. I join with you, my colleagues all, in wishing for him a deserved, contented, and extensive period of retirement with his splendid family in his beloved hills of South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the fact that the distinguished President of the United States, for whom I have a great respect and admiration, knows something about this situation. I recognize that the distinguished leadership on both sides of the aisle have a knowledge of this situation. I recognize that the military have a knowledge of this situation, but I make the statement without fear of successful contradiction that none of us know more about the true situation that exists in this controversial foreign field than the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, who has devoted the major part, the better years of his life, to the one study of our foreign relations, while these other gentlemen have had so many, so multitudinous duties and problems to confront them and to solve.

Now, what has happened here? The gentleman from Arkansas wants to restore these funds, in the amount, I understand, of \$1,109,000,000. The gentleman from South Carolina, who is a great authority on this subject, wants to leave it as the committee reported it out. This is \$277,675,000 more money than we appropriated last year. I had hoped that somewhere down the line we would be able to taper off, but instead, apparently, year after year, we are increasing this foreign aid.

Mr. Chairman, in 1945, even before the beginning of this foreign aid under the Marshall plan, as chairman of the Post War Economic Policy and Planning Committee, I recommended that some financial aid be extended by this country to the less fortunate war-ridden victims of the Nazis. I thought then that some aid was necessary to aid those countries in rehabilitating themselves. For the first few years I supported this program, with reservations because of the gigantic

sums involved. On several occasions I endeavored, by appropriate amendment, to cut down on what I regarded as unnecessary and stupendous amounts of the taxpayers' money. Failing in these efforts, for the past several years, I have opposed and voted my protest against the entire bill. What started out to be a reasonable program has grown into sums that were not, in my opinion, justified. In fact, since this program started, we have sent to these foreign countries more than \$50 billion. Surely, even this rich country cannot continue that program. Even the three billion dollars plus in this bill, without this amendment, cannot be justified. Therefore, regardless of the action taken on this amendment, I shall continue my protest by voting against the bill.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being boresome, I repeat again what I have stated on many occasions on this floor and elsewhere. The real danger to this country lies not in the fear of a Russian invasion, but in the destruction of the economy of this country by the continuous deflation of our currency and reckless spending with the resultant destruction of our economy. Certainly, it is time for this Congress, the representatives of the people, to stop a little while, consider a little while, and take a true evaluation of our own situation. For, if we destroy our own economy by becoming too generous with all others, who will come to our aid?

Finally, I think that if we have learned anything out of this whole program, we have learned that you cannot buy friendship abroad anymore than you can buy it at home. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there is no question of the honesty of motive of any Member involved in the consideration of the bill today. Nobody questions the motives of any Member. So, we can rule that out. It should not be the subject of further discussion by any Member, whether they are for an increase or against the bill, or anything else. We are all sitting here as Americans, trying to do the best we can under the circumstances. We may have our different views, but where there is a difference we respect the views that everyone entertains. That is the spirit of America and that is the spirit of decency.

As I view the question, we are discussing a military question today. We are discussing something that relates to the national defense of the United States. There are some who honestly believe we should never have done anything in the past. I respect their views, but if we had not where would the world be today? We would probably be alone, with the world dominated by the Communists. I certainly do not want

to see a Communist-dominated world. I would never admit that a Communist-dominated world could defeat my country, but I would not want to see my country placed in the position of having to defend itself against such a situation.

Politically, it is probably the best thing to vote against all appropriations. That is the line of least resistance. I can remember in this Chamber a few months before Pearl Harbor on the bill for the extension of the Selective Service Act, that it barely passed this body by a vote of 202 to 201. Politically it would have been better to vote against it, those who voted for it, and in all probability the 201 who voted against the bill were just as good Americans as I and the others who voted for the bill. But I have often wondered how they would have felt after Pearl Harbor if the extension was defeated by 1 or more votes, instead of being passed in this body by the thin margin of 1 vote.

So, we are discussing essentially something of a military nature. General Gruenther says we need \$600 million as a minimum. Are we going to disregard General Gruenther? President Eisenhower, who we all admit is a great military leader and who some of my friends in the Republican Party say "I like Ike," in their district, but they vote against him in this Chamber—he is a great military man. He pleaded with us the other night. Nobody present at that meeting could forget the feeling that the President of the United States put into what he had to say about the importance of it. I asked the question that developed the fact that a minimum of \$600 million was necessary. That is how the \$600 million was arrived at. My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will remember I asked "What is the minimum needed?" It developed to be \$600 million. The President of the United States is my President. He may be a Republican in politics but when he occupies the office he does, he is my President. We sat there as Americans and we are serving him as Americans.

This is a matter concerning foreign affairs and concerning the national security of our country. It was Senator Vandenberg who said "bipartisanship exits." I agree with him. We do not want to see it destroyed or weakened. Those who are voting for the \$1,100,000,000 cut—I do not say they want to weaken it, but I say the results will have a weakening effect. We do not want to take a chance. I would rather err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness. Let us not be deceived by the smile and the slap on the back by the Communist leaders. Let us realize there is tension going on behind the Iron Curtain. It is up to us to capitalize on those tensions. Let us realize that everything is not all happy behind the Iron Curtain. There are millions in the Soviet Union who have been indoctrinated for years with the fact that Stalin was a superman. I do not think they are going to take this campaign to destroy him very easily. It will create division in the minds of those people. They are not going to destroy him overnight; there are divisions there and we should capitalize on them to the fullest extent we can,



bring about discontent, then division; that is the thing for us to do. Then the effect upon Poland. Ninety-five percent of the people of Poland hate the Communists. Lithuania, squelched out. Latvia, Estonia also—you do not hear anything about those countries, they are not given even satellite status. Probably 85 percent of the people of Czechoslovakia hate the Communists and are waiting for deliverance. They are waiting for America.

Those are the things we Americans can do, Mr. Chairman. We are making our contribution. History is being made. How? The future will tell. What we do makes our contribution, and we should grant the increase of \$600 million the President, the President of the United States, asks be restored. I am not thinking about bailing the President out in this matter; that is not in my mind; I am thinking about the national interests of my country as I view it.

The President says it is necessary; Gruenther says it is necessary; the Joint Chiefs of Staff say it is necessary. Who am I, a layman, to say that they are wrong? They are the men I must look to and that you must look to and other people also to lead our forces and defend our country in case of another war.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If that is so where are the details that support these things? That is what I am looking for and that is what the Congress wants.

Mr. McCORMACK. Where are the what?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The details to support the request the gentleman is making.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman in his own time can tell what the details are.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, I am asking you.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can express his own views; I am expressing mine.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am asking the gentleman to tell me.

Mr. McCORMACK. The details of this? It means there will be a stockpile of nuclear weapons over there in those bases. It means that the B-47's which cannot fly from continent to continent can make 10 trips a month in case of attack—we cannot leave that out—instead of 3 or 4 trips a month otherwise by the B-54's.

There are six divisions of Americans over there, our own boys. The psychological effect of appropriating this \$600 million is going to be very great on the morale of our own 6 divisions over there if those monsters should decide to move, and you know they will do it if they think they have a chance to be successful.

Then there is Korea. Major General Bard the other day ordered the truce teams out. I do not know whether they will be kept out, but I hope he is supported, I hope there is no withdrawal from his position.

We know what the delegates from Czechoslovakia and Poland have been doing.

Secretary Robertson only the other day in a speech referred to what is happening in South Vietnam and the violation of the truce there by the Communists.

You and I know what is happening. This is a time for strength, this is the time to show firmness, if for no other reason than a psychological one. Frankly, I will support that amendment, and we as Members of the House charged with the responsibility that we are, if from no other angle than the psychological angle should realize how necessary it is to put back the \$600 million that everyone familiar with the military aspect says is absolutely essential and is the minimum amount in the national interest of our country.

I am not voting that money just to help some other country; I am voting for it because I think it is in the national interest of my own country, and I am doing it because of the national interest of my own country. I do not care whether the President who recommends it is a Republican or not; that is immaterial to me. The question is: Do I think it is in the national interest of my country? And I do.

The viewpoint of the President, whoever he is, will receive my serious consideration; the viewpoint of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will receive my serious consideration; the viewpoint of General Gruenther will receive my serious consideration. Based upon the evidence I have before me, my conscience says to vote on the side of strength and not on the side of weakness. Therefore I hope the amendment increasing the amount by \$600 million will be adopted. I appreciate the effort of my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], but I think the best thing to do is to get behind the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I opposed the cut in the committee and was in favor of providing the full amount for the mutual security program. In my opinion, the entire amount should be restored by the Congress and I hope it is restored.

I agree with preceding speakers that it certainly would be very disastrous to go below the amount provided in the amendment offered by my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

I would like to draw attention to some figures in connection with our defense program. For the fiscal year of 1957 I call attention to the fact that expenditures were estimated by the President at \$65.9 billion. The purposes of these expenditures are as follows: 64 percent for protection, 21 percent for civil benefits, 11 percent for interest, and 4 percent for civil operations and administration.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no better way of putting our military leadership in the world in its proper and dramatic perspective than to point out that of the \$65.9 billion included in the budget to be spent during the next fiscal year for the purpose of operating the Federal Government, \$42.4 billion was set aside for protection. I would like to call at-

tention also to the fact, as has been mentioned here today, that on May 10 by a vote of 377 to 0 this House passed the defense appropriation bill making appropriations of \$33,635,000,000 for the Defense Department for the ensuing year.

Mr. Chairman, the difference between the \$33,635,000,000 and \$42.4 billion as suggested in the budget is made up by the mutual security and other programs in connection with defense. The point we ought to keep in mind is that the mutual security program is only about 10 percent of the entire defense program and it is part and parcel of the defense program. So, if we are going to pass a bill by a vote of 377 to nothing, as we did for the defense program with reference to our Military Establishment, I cannot see how we can reason that the remainder of the defense program should be cut by the amount that was cut in the committee.

I think, as we carefully look over the program as it has operated during the past years, we must agree that the program has been successful. We are in a particularly crucial period in our history, with tremendous power resulting from the nuclear revolution in which we find ourselves. Because of this extremely crucial period it is necessary to continue this program which has been successful. The program should not be hurt at this particular time, at a time when the Soviet Union has adopted new tactics but has not changed its fundamental philosophy. We should not hesitate at a period when we are on the verge of great victories in our mutual security effort.

Furthermore, the greatest military genius of our time, the President of the United States, has constantly advocated and requested the full amount of the mutual security program. I, for one, Mr. Chairman, do not want to take the responsibility of cutting the funds which the President says he needs in order to implement the foreign policy of the United States. Projected against the background of our expenditures for defense, this is a small amount of money. One billion dollars against \$42.4 billion or against the money—\$33.6 billion—that we appropriated for the Department of Defense only a few weeks ago in this House is not large in comparison. It would be of tremendous psychological advantage, Mr. Chairman, to retrace this amount.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hays amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the administration has proposed an overall review or restudy of the mutual security program. This indicates that the administration is uncertain, not about the need for a mutual security program, but the emphasis that should be given to various parts of it. This uncertainty is caused by shifts of Soviet tactics that have taken place in the past year or 18 months. I feel that the administration's proposal is not only warranted but that this restudy and review must take place. Pending and during such a review and restudy, I recognize the fact that a reasonable mutual security program should and must be continued.

The possibility of executive review does not, however, lessen the responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Congress to seek a full justification of the authorization request that has been made by the executive branch of our Government. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the able leadership of our chairman, has accepted that responsibility, and after some 2 months of very careful review recommended the bill that is now before the House.

The decrease in military funds by \$1 billion was adopted by an 18-to-11 bipartisan committee vote. Almost two-thirds of the members of that committee who were present voted in favor of the reductions after having heard testimony from representatives of every branch of our Government connected with the administration and the planning of this program. But in spite of the committee's recommendations a last-minute effort is being made to restore more than half of the reduction that the committee recommended. Statements have been issued that this program will be seriously impaired or even wrecked if these funds are not restored to the bill.

Yet, each year since this program has been in operation, the Congress has voted less than the amount requested by the Executive. In 1950, the Congress reduced the request of the Executive by \$583 million. In 1951 it was reduced by \$813 million. The reduction in 1952 was \$1,217,000,000. In 1953 the cut was \$1,888,000,000. In 1954 the Executive's request was again cut, this time by \$1,297,000,000. In 1955 the reduction was \$894 million. Last year the request of the Executive was reduced \$826 million by the Congress.

Each year that these reductions have been made, protests similar to those now being voiced have been heard. Yet the program has continued to operate and, at the end of the present fiscal year, it is estimated that the program's unexpended balance will be approximately \$6,600,000,000. That amount is sufficient to continue the mutual security program without any further appropriation for nearly 2 years. Yet the committee is recommending in this bill an authorization of an additional \$3,600,000,000 that it sincerely believes will keep the so-called pipeline safely in operation.

Notwithstanding this past history, the committee did not make reductions indiscriminately. Other important factors indicated a substantial reduction in the Executive's request was justified. Almost \$5,600,000,000 of unexpended military funds is now in the so-called pipeline. Of this amount, \$3,600,000,000 is earmarked for European programs. Most of these programs were worked out when German rearmament was scheduled to follow a more accelerated pace, before France moved a large part of her forces to North Africa and before several NATO countries indicated contemplated reductions in their defense budgets.

These facts, coupled with the knowledge that the equipment to be supplied

by the European pipeline funds can be transferred to other areas, were sufficient to convince almost two-thirds of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including our distinguished chairman, that a reduction in military funds could be made without injuring this program. I therefore urge the House to uphold the committee's action and defeat the Hays amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for 14 years now I have been hearing the same story. When I came here in 1943 it was lend-lease. The same arguments, the same tactics that were used at that time are being employed now.

In fact, after the war ended, and including 1950, even when the war started in Korea, the pipe line was still filled with war implements going to Joe Stalin in the Kremlin—up to and including the Korean war.

Then, of course, when lend-lease proved such a dismal failure, they had to come out with a new gimmick. They just changed the name of it to UNRRA and the administration of that was so disgraceful that that lasted only 2 years. They knew they could not put that program over in the Congress any more, so they dug up with another kind of gimmick called the Marshall plan. And, believe it or not, when the original Marshall plan was proposed in this Congress, even the Kremlin was invited to come in and get its share. But the arguments for all of these were the same. In the clutch always the big wheels came over here to the floor and said, "If you do not give these billions awful things are going to happen to the future and the security of America." The big wheels try to scare the hell out of you if you do not go along.

Then when the Marshall plan proved such a dismal failure, they just brought in still a new gimmick, dressed it up under another name, and now called it mutual security. There is nothing mutual about it, and if anybody finds any security in it I would like to find out where it is.

The amendment to restore part of this cut, the very wording of it, even if anyone were partial for restoration of the cut, is such that all Members of Congress should vote against it. Mind you, if this amendment is adopted, it would give the Department of State and the Pentagon practically a scot-free voice on what they will do with that money, that is the \$2,500,000,000, that could be used for military expenditures in European countries. It will knock out any earmarking of any funds to Spain. Do not let the leaders fool you about Spain. The only reason Spain is getting aid today from the United States is not because the Pentagon wanted it, not because the State Department wanted it. I remember in 1947 when I offered the amendment to include Spain in the Marshall plan the Pentagon and the State Department almost had a hemorrhage. The only reason Spain is receiving aid today is that the Congress of the United

States of America in its wisdom jammed it down their throats, earmarked the money, and said, "You must spend it for that purpose and that purpose only." Even after it was appropriated by this Congress it took 3 years before the Pentagon and the State Department unloaded one dime in the country of Spain. That is how much they were interested in mutual security with Spain.

I have not been there, but you Members of Congress who have made a study of all these foreign assistance programs will verify that the only place we are getting our money's worth is in Spain. And remember we jammed it down the throats of the leaders of our country. They did not want it. The Congress in its wisdom forced it upon them. If you adopt this amendment, Spain is not going to be earmarked for any money. Since they did not want to do it in the first place we have reason to believe they will not do it unless it is earmarked. They will have \$2,500,000,000 to spend at their discretion, which very likely means that they will have some \$48 million more to give Marshal Tito, which is probably their plan. Why they are doing that I do not know, is madness and needs the attention of expert psychiatrists.

We all know that communism has a new look. Let us examine that new look. The man who is really going to deliver the new look all over the world, the man who has set the stage for it, the man who was selected to do the job, is Marshal Tito, who now is arm in arm with the Kremlin. His present visit to the Kremlin quotes him as saying: "Nothing will ever divide us again, nothing will ever come between us again, even the \$1 billion I got from Uncle Sam. Nothing will come between us again. We are one now and forever."

What is Tito's purpose under this new look under communism? With the taxpayers' money, the United States of America has built for the Kremlin a Communist showcase in Yugoslavia that they can show all over the world, to prove that you can be a member of the Communist orbit, that you can be in the family of the Kremlin, and you can still get billions of dollars from Uncle Sam.

Why do you suppose Tito went to India? Why do you suppose he went to Egypt? Why do you suppose he went to France? Why do you suppose he went to England? For his own good? Do not be naive. He has a mission to perform. Tito now has a billion-dollar showcase in Yugoslavia built with American money and armed with American jet planes. He is going to all of these countries and saying to them, "Look, this idea that if the Communists take over, that if your country goes Communist, you are going to get all your orders from the Kremlin, that is all hogwash. Look at me. I am a member of the Communist family, I am a member of the Communist orbit. I do as I please. I got a billion dollars from Uncle Sam. Why don't you join the Communist orbit and do the same thing? You can be a good Communist and faithful to the Kremlin and still get billions from Uncle Sam."

Tito today is being used as a super salesman of what can be done with a



country if it joins the Communist orbit. If Congress is going to continue to give Tito the \$300 million which I understand is still in the pipelines, there is something wrong upstairs. Yet in this bill some \$30 million more earmarked for Tito in economic aid. How much military aid he is being given is supposed to be a secret. But, mind you, he certainly is telling the Kremlin right now how much military aid he is getting from the United States and what chumps we are.

Right now Tito is telling the Kremlin how much military aid he is getting from the United States. It is all right for the Kremlin to know how much military aid he is getting, but we Members of Congress are not supposed to know. We are not supposed to know how much aid Tito is going to get. We are not to be trusted. But Tito is.

Now, I hear a lot about "Follow the leader." I respect my leaders, but if I went home and told my people I was going to just sit in my office and draw \$22,500 and let my leaders do the thinking for me, tell my people that I am not going to do any reading or any thinking, that I am just going to do what the leaders tell me, do you know what my people would do to me? They would do what I deserve to have done. They would kick me out. I was sent here to do my own thinking. Is there anybody in this Congress who will deny that our State Department and our military have committed blunder after blunder throughout the world? Is there anybody here who will deny that? Then why should we follow them? Just as they were wrong on this Spanish aid issue—they talked about this foreign-aid program stopping communism. The queerest thing is that the places where we have given the least aid are the places where we have had the least trouble with communism. Spain is one. Norway is another. Sweden is another. The "funny" part is that the countries we have given the most money, France and Italy, have more active members of the Communist Party than they have in Russia itself. Even though they say they are stopping communism with this foreign-aid program, you have more active, signed-up members of the Communists than in Russia itself. That is where we have poured in most of our billions of dollars under this foreign-aid program. If this bill passes with a continuation of aid to Tito, you are doing for the free world a damage which no amount of billions of dollars or human lives will ever repair, because he is the man that they are now depending upon under "the New Look" to get other countries of the world into the Communist orbit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] has again expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, in a great many instances emotionalism and

rock-and-roll tactics on the part of the leadership can be more convincing than actual facts and good sound logic.

Last year, when the Congress in its wisdom reduced the budget request by an amount in excess of \$500 million, it was bemoaned that we had wrecked the program. May I assure each member of the committee that we did not wreck the foreign-aid program; rather we helped it. I have asked at least 20 witnesses who appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the money phase of this bill if the reduction last year actually hampered the program in any way. Without exception the answer was "No." Make no mistake about it, we did not hamper the program in any way by making a reduction of in excess of \$500 million last year.

You will remember there was one item of \$200 million for the Far East. Our committee was informed that if this item were reduced the President's hands would be tied and the program greatly handicapped.

Notwithstanding that report, we reduced the request from \$200 million to \$100 million. Did we hurt the program? No. Witnesses before the committee this year said that notwithstanding the fact that the Congress allowed only \$100 million, they were able to obligate only \$6 million of the \$100 million, or, only 6 percent.

Let me give you some facts which were borne out by your own able chairman and which will be borne out later by the Appropriations Subcommittee.

The average lead time covering military items in this program is 24 months. That is, 2 years elapse from the time the Congress appropriates the money until the equipment is delivered to the recipient nations.

It has been established that if the annual appropriation is approximately \$2.5 billion, the average annual expenditure is \$2.5 billion, and the lead time is 2 years, then certainly \$5 billion in the pipeline is adequate. Using round figures, subject to correction, the Department charged with spending these funds expended \$2.3 billion in fiscal 1955 and \$2.2 billion in fiscal 1956.

It is anticipated the appropriation this year will be \$2.7 billion, still maintaining the average of approximately \$2.5 billion. As long as you keep \$5 billion in the pipeline unexpended you have a well-functioning program and no harm will be done. That fact was well established in testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

At the close of the fiscal year on June 30, according to very recent estimates, there will be in excess of \$5 billion in the pipeline, and if you allow \$2.5 billion for fiscal 1957 then there will be available for this phase of the program more money than can be spent. This fact was also well established by testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Will you please keep in mind that approximately \$500 million of the funds requested for fiscal 1957 is for weapons still in the planning stage. It may be many years hence before even one dime of the \$500 million requested for these special weapons will be expended.

We should not be lifted off our feet by rock-and-roll tactics of emotionalism.

I just cannot understand, I cannot comprehend why anyone would argue that even \$1 of the reduction made by the committee should be reinstated in the bill. I can assure you that the request for reinstatement is not based on facts and figures.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to ask the committee some questions, but before doing so I want to point out that in the past I have voted for many of these authorization bills. I am in favor of the general principle behind the mutual security program. Eliminating the oratory in behalf of this particular bill I agree with its purposes, but to me the question is to get into the details to find out what we are actually accomplishing.

In the past I regret to say that the committee's reports themselves indicate that they cannot get into the details. I have gone through these hearings, this report and listened to the debate yesterday to try to find out what the details are. The committee members themselves say it is precious little, in fact it has been stated that we must take this on faith. But the Congress was not set up to take things on faith; the Congress was set up as an instrumentality of the people who cannot dig into this for themselves, who cannot come down to Washington and do it for themselves. They send us as their representatives to do this for them. If we fail in that function we fail in our basic function. Someone has said that we have a provision in here which will stop some of these socialistic programs that we have been engaged in abroad. The term "socialism" is a vague one, a hard one to define. It is defined not by words. You have to go into and examine each program specifically to find out what the administration, whoever the Executive is, whether it is Truman or Eisenhower, proposes. We have to know what the specific programs we are talking about are. The Congress must examine into them through its committees and find out whether they meet with American principles as the people's representatives see them.

I should like to ask a few questions, and I will direct them to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] because I know he has studied this aspect of the matter as carefully as anyone could. There has been a lot of discussion about pipeline figures. On page 13 of the committee report is found a pipeline figure of 6.4; then right below there we have the unexpended balances at 5 billion. The question is, Are those figures to be added together, or how much of the pipeline figures actually include unexpended balances of military funds?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman will note that the first figure of 6.4 was the estimate on November 30, 1955. It was broken down by areas. The latter figure of 5 billion is as of June 30, 1956 and that estimate was made on May 16, both of them referring to unexpended balances.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, in this instance pipeline and unexpended balances are synonymous?

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. I was unable to find other figures in the hearings. Of course, all I could do was to flip through the hearings as best I could. How much of the military expenditures will go for off-shore procurement? The reason I ask that is this: After all, the off-shore program is also going to assist these countries in their economic situation; therefore, it is a figure that becomes quite important in viewing this program.

Mr. VORYS. Is the gentleman directing a question to me?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. On page 648 of the hearings are the figures on offshore production; \$110 million for this year—that is fiscal 1956—and \$75 to \$80 million for next year.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is a very small amount. Is that the best you have been able to do?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. We had very large figures for the offshore program during the Korean war when our own munition plants were loaded up. Then there was considerable criticism of the offshore procurement program because many members wanted to keep the business at home. So the offshore procurement program has dropped down very sharply.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The general program certainly is a way of assisting these countries economically; is that true?

Mr. VORYS. That is true, but that is a secondary, indirect purpose. Our main purpose is to build up their own defense production. For instance, included in the offshore program for next year, or possibly in addition, is a provision for weapons facilities. What we want to do is to get them going through the offshore program to provide production lines so that they can start producing their own ammunition and weapons.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. The countries in Europe are spending about \$12 billion a year compared to a request here of \$760 million for Europe from our own country. It is my hope, and I think it is the plan, that through the offshore program we give them some economic aid, but we also provide production lines so that they will increasingly take on the burden of providing their own weapons and ammunition. They will be doing this, at least in Europe, in a few years.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. One other specific question before I ask a general question. How about a breakdown of the common use items for the military as opposed to other military end items?

Mr. VORYS. In the military assistance amount of \$1.925 billions there is \$1.55 billion in the committee bill for military weapons, equipment, training, and shipping. Included in the military figure is \$374 million for direct forces support, which is common-use items, food, clothing, and things like that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of course, if you dig into those allegedly military items, I think experience will show and I am sure the Committees on Appropriations and on Armed Services agree, that a lot of those are common-use items. This is the procedural error in having the Foreign Affairs Committee attempt to go over military programs.

Mr. VORYS. There is \$374 million for direct forces support.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I meant in addition to that sum.

The final question is this. Last year there was considerable criticism in the committee report and hearings and on the floor directed at the failure of the executive departments to support their requests by details; in fact, charges of fiscal irresponsibility were made. I made a floor speech directed to this subject last year. Has the presentation this year been any better?

Mr. VORYS. I think so. Perkins McGuire, an able businessman who was president and director of Allied Stores, and was in charge of procurement for that great organization, is now sitting on top of that end of it, and I believe we have an increasingly reliable accounting system. May I just say this, when you try to get figures on this, you are shooting at a moving target. There is material moving all over the world, and when you call for a report on a given day, it is different by noon on that day. Mr. McGuire has pointed out the difficulty of presenting accurate figures unless you have a running account going on all the time and have a lot of people doing nothing but figuring.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. I regret that the reports, hearings, and the debate on the floor to date do not give much support to this conclusion. I believe progress has been made, but not the progress that this Congress must insist upon in order to discharge its responsibilities. Last year we failed to insist that the executive departments come forward with accurate accountings, although there was plenty of time to do this. Each year that the Congress fails to insist upon proper accounting from the executive departments we make matters worse, not better.

Regretfully I state that special conferences between the Chief Executive and the leaders of the House do not take the place of orderly presentation of detailed facts and figures to the congressional committee charged with digging into these details. If the Chief Executive feels that more money than the committee recommends in this bill is needed for the mutual security program, let the committee be called back—this bill recommitted—and let the details sustaining such a position be presented to it for orderly and proper consideration.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before this Congress plunges the treasure of the American people, under the title of foreign aid, into the greatest financial ambush in the history of international delusions, and before we here deliberately decoy ourselves into this multi-billion-dollar anti-American snare, I plead to be permitted to offer a few words of warning.

To me, foreign aid represents perhaps the most tragic mistake in the history of American Government. It is the diversion of America's liquid wealth, technical know-how, highly prized American talent, skill, labor, and resources, into the bottomless pit of European and Asiatic hate. But who can gainsay the obvious fact that the dollars we spend abroad by this complicated system of gifts and near gifts must in the end play a mighty role in the goal of Europe, Asia, and the Kremlin to beggar the American people?

We are, in truth, using American dollars, earned by Americans, to build up a colossal wall of foreign competition against the interests of American management, American capital, and American labor. We are using our American dollars to buy foreign competition against ourselves.

We are not only buying competition—we are building it from the ground up, and then keeping it subsidized.

The insidiousness that foreign aid implies is all the worse for the fact that it wears the face of being kind and doing good for the backward and depressed peoples of the world. What backward peoples, and for what purposes are we helping them?

Those American dollars did not grow in the fields, all stacked and counted, ready for the greedy hand that in the next moment would not, and does not hesitate to strike at us. Those dollars came from the sweat and labor of 167 million American people.

I beg that this House remember that fact with reverence and caution before it even begins to think of turning over the amount the President has asked for—upward of \$5 billion—for foreign aid, which I call the greatest global fraud since money first became a medium of barter and exchange. "Foreign aid" is a misnomer. If it is a question of foreign aid in the real sense, then we have more than fulfilled our obligation to our own conscience and the conscience of every European and Asiatic.

When England stood with her back to the wall; when the Russian people were fighting the Nazis within 25 miles of Moscow; when France was, as a nation, wiped off the face of the earth, and the streets of Paris echoed to the Prussian goosestep, we gave our wealth as if it were water, our economic strength as if it were endless, and the lives of American youth to rescue them from tyranny and slavery.

What more do they want? What more do they have the right to ask for? Mr. Chairman, is this to go on forever?

Already we are being asked to furnish foreign military and economic aid



programs—not on the basis of a current need—but more; on the basis of long-term commitments.

This is not fighting communism, if that is the purpose. Communism cannot be fought by enriching people less prosperous.

What good does it do when our profession for interest for others is blackened by the continuing colonialism of France and the imperialism of Britain?

The fact that they can both point the accusing finger at the Kremlin's even more diabolical colonialism merely provides the world with another wrong that does not add up to a right.

Any one of the presumably anti-Communist countries would, at the drop of a hat, boldly do business on the biggest possible scale with Communist Russia. Only the other day were not the top Government officials of both England and the Soviet Union lunching, dining, and toasting one another in London? Yet we are being asked to pour vast fortunes into the coffers of those who turn their backs on us when our enemy bows to them, and, who face us, hat in hand, waiting for our cash. The folly of the past in our foreign-aid program stares at us in cold, incredible figures. It bought us—not allies, but envy; it bought us—not friends, but enemies; it bought us—not gratitude, but resentment.

The average mind cannot encompass the fabulous arithmetic of foreign aid. United States foreign aid to all countries for the period covering World War II, and the postwar period ending June 30, 1955, came to \$9 billion.

I am not flattered by being told that this is the greatest Nation on earth, since the Roman Empire, or that we have wealth unparalleled in all time.

The figure I have just given you is beyond all reason. I shall never be convinced that any government has the moral right to hand out such vast sums of the people's money to nations of dubious loyalty—to nations which only yesterday, as history counts time, were our bitterest and most relentless foes.

While with one lavish hand we are putting our money up in bales to send abroad, we are with the other figuring our devices for providing our farmers with less and less. To that important segment of our population that has, since 1952, been suffering from loss of income—the stepchild of prosperous America—we have been talking of instituting soil banks. Our growers of rice, tobacco, cotton, and potatoes, our growers of wheat and livestock are in trouble. In the plight of our farmers our attention is concentrated not on them, but on helping to finance, among other things, the greatest architectural structure of all times—the Aswan Dam project, so that the Egyptians can grow more and better cotton to compete with American cotton. Here on American soil we talk of reducing farm acreage, while we talk of spending billions for dams to enable the Egyptians to irrigate their soil to grow more and more of the very product for which we have no market.

Is this right? Is this moral? Is this justice to ourselves?

The very critics who have declared the New and the Fair Deals to be just so much socialism are now most active in sponsoring this foreign-aid program, the most internationally socialistic scheme ever devised since Lenin foisted Marx on Russia, and the Soviet Union upon the free world.

We in America must begin to be deeply concerned about the plight of our aged population. There is a vast fool's paradise in the story of America's prosperity, accentuated by what is perhaps the deepest tragedy of America's pride in her wealth. It is the problem of our aged, which shames America's boast of economic prowess and endless resources. If Congress is looking for people who need help, I ask that we turn our eyes inwardly—not in the direction of Pakistan and Peru, but right here on America's aged and infirm. It should shock our sense of justice to its foundations that the 14 million among us over 65 years of age have an average income—for man and wife—of less than \$1,500. To a population reared in self-respect this tells a humiliating story of conditions existing among our own people. Will we let this go on? And in so doing will we continue to empty vast mountains of our treasure to peoples in far-off countries? The savings of these elderly folk in our midst are less than \$500. Great gains have been made in the past 20 years, but against the votes and the influence of those who called social security socialism, and who today reluctantly render it lip service. They now find that social security has been proved not only sound, but politically profitable. I find that while the Federal Government employs over 2 million people, only 9 of these are working on the problems of old age. Again the fat hand that is so full of largesse for the people on the other side of the earth turns thin and scrawny when it comes to dealing with the pressing problem in the midst of our own population. Hundreds of thousands will be employed to further foreign aid, but only nine on the future of our mothers and fathers—and, eventually, of ourselves.

Let us, I pray, first set our own house in order. Let us do what we Democrats have long advocated—reduce to 62 the age when women, including the wives or widows of men covered by social security, may be entitled to their benefits. Let us add the provision to the social-security program that an employee 50 years old, or older, be awarded his or her benefits in the event he or she is totally and permanently disabled. Let us set ourselves like flint against the influence of those who would cut down the social-security program.

To me there is something distinctly unpleasant and intensely distasteful in an administration which with one voice asks for nearly \$5 billion for foreign aid, while with another throws a roadblock in the path of social security.

I notice that on the question of special housing for the aged, the champions of the self-respect of our elderly population turn out to be none other than our own Democratic stalwarts. Before I would advocate expending support to foreign aid I would use it all up for low-

rent housing projects for older American families. Instead of supporting foreign aid I shall find myself supporting medical care for the aged—right here in the United States.

When the Congress of the United States has lived up to its principles as the representative of a great Nation by first taking care of those in need at home, it will have won, by its example, the respect of all mankind. This is the kind of respect I should like to see America earn for herself—the kind of respect that cannot be bought with foreign aid. This is the respect that will help us in the leadership of the free world. It is this kind of respect that will help all mankind.

In Congress it is my endeavor to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves—the lame, the halt, and the blind; the weak and afflicted, and those who have no one to speak for them.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I want to compliment the gentleman on his very able presentation of the case against this international giveaway program, particularly at a time when the gentleman's constituents, the little cotton and rice farmers, are sweating and laboring under an income of less than \$1,000 a year.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. And in addition we vote money to sink 2,000 artesian wells in arid India not to produce food for the starving people of India but to produce cotton in competition with Louisiana cotton.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a good many today have expressed the hope they had when mutual security was started that by this time, 11 years after the end of the war, we could greatly cut down this program by which we are trying to help other nations defend their own independence and remain part of the free world. I certainly understand and share in that feeling of regret that we are not able as yet to taper off this program as we had hoped. Everybody here wishes we could reduce our expenditures for mutual security, just as we wish and hope the day will come soon when we can reduce our own defense budget.

You will recall that right after the end of the war we brought our forces home, demobilized them, and cut our defense budget down to about \$13 billion a year. Then, partly because we withdrew so quickly and did not carry on a program of this sort, weak spots were left in the world and the Soviet Union moved into them. It instigated a war in Korea which immediately forced our own defense budget up to above \$50 billion a year. It has been running about 34, 35, or 36 billion dollars annually. It came down somewhat after Korean fighting ended, but this year it has gone back up again because the threat is greater.

We have seen recently the interesting phenomenon of a great many Members contending our own defense budget is

inadequate and advocating that we appropriate more money for planes and missiles and weapons of defense; but at the same time they are urging that we cut down this program which builds the defenses of our allies. In short they urge that we make the same mistake we made 10 years ago of failing to maintain a strong world. But if by weakness anywhere we encourage new Communist aggression, it will require that we spend billions more—not billions less. It is not real economy.

Mr. Chairman, I think our country is in greater danger today than at any time since the end of the war. Both Communist strength and Communist trickery and seductive appeal are greater than ever before. I do not think it was necessary that we be in this position. I tried my best all during the years to get changes in certain policies which I feared would lead, unless changed, to the losses in Asia which have brought us to right where we are.

But that is water over the dam. We have to deal with the facts as they are. And there are two plain facts: One, the Kremlin's military strength is greater today than it has ever been. Two, it is operating more effectively and dangerously, and entering in a larger way the economic field, seeking to beguile, deceive, bribe its intended victims as it maneuvers to gain control of ever larger portions of the world.

Those are the facts. It does no good to regret or lament or bewail them. There they are. My country, I believe, is in greater danger than it has ever been. I cannot accept responsibility for increasing the danger by accepting this billion dollar cut.

I recall a similar situation in August 1949, when there was a bipartisan amendment to increase military aid to the forces trying to prevent Communist conquest of China. During that debate I said, "We are not trying to throw money away as charged. We simply recognize that Communist conquest of China will be a mortal peril to all Asia; and conquest of Asia will constitute a mortal peril to Europe and to the United States. I cannot accept responsibility for not making every possible effort myself and authorizing the President and the Secretary of State and our Armed Forces to make, within reason, every possible effort to accomplish this end."

The amendment was defeated. China went down. That changed the balance of power in the world, made possible the Korean war, and has already cost us scores of billions of dollars. We must not be so shortsighted again.

Someone has said today that he could not go back to his district and tell his farmers who are hard up and others who are in financial difficulties that he has voted to increase the amount of their money to be spent for foreign aid. I certainly can understand that. My people are tired, too. They need plenty more things for themselves. Some of them believe that if we spend less for foreign aid we can spend more for ourselves at home. But that does not follow. On page 7 of our report is a quotation from testimony by the Honorable Gordon Gray, of North Carolina, former Secre-

tary of the Army in a Democratic administration, and now Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs in a Republican administration. He testified that "but for the military forces generated, stimulated, and assisted by our mutual assistance program, to attain the same measure of military security in the world, our own forces would have to be larger." To expand our own forces really takes money.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conscientiously go back to my people in the Fifth District of Minnesota and say that by voting against the Hays amendment, I voted to reduce their security in Minnesota; I voted to endanger their country; I voted to require more of their boys to spend longer periods in our Armed Forces. I cannot go back to them and say that I voted to require them to spend more, not less, of their precious earnings for the defense budget of our Nation—and still have less security because we would have fewer advanced bases close to the potential enemy.

This proposed billion-dollar cut will require cuts of between 14 and 27 percent in our programs to various countries whose defense establishments are vital to our own security. And what will it do to their morale and their confidence? Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe it is wise to make such a cut. For myself I can see no other course than to do all I can to support the duly chosen officials of our country in their terrible responsibilities. If I am to err I would rather err on the side of greater security for my country than on the side of lesser security. I hope the Hays amendment to restore \$600 million of the cut will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, Shakespeare once wrote a play entitled "Timon of Athens." In this play Shakespeare presented the picture of a wealthy man, a man who was possessed of lands and servants and much of this world's goods. Timon had many erstwhile friends. He was careless, however, in the spending of his wealth. He bailed his friends out of prison; he contributed dowries to those who wanted to get married; he had many elegant banquets at which he wine and dined his fair-weather friends. Plutus, the God of gold, was but his steward. No need, but he repaid sevenfold above itself, and no gift to him but it assured the giver "a return exceeding all use of quittance."

Repeatedly, his faithful servants came to him and implored him that the time had long since passed when he should begin to pay his bills and give some attention to the demands of his creditors. But Timon, out of his big heart, continued in his foolish ways. There came a day, however, when he had to face the

facts, but it was too late. And then when he was bankrupt he sent his servants to beseech his friends to contribute to him 50 talents or some other sum in order that he might pay his debts. Not one of his friends responded with a gift. Each had an excuse. Timon's lands were sold to discharge his debts, and the once proud and good man was forced to seek shelter in a cave outside of Athens.

I shall not belabor you with a continuation of the story, but there are two important points that I want to impress upon you: Firstly, Timon foolishly and recklessly squandered his wealth; and, secondly, when it was too late, he found that his wealth and his gifts had not brought him friends.

The lesson in Shakespeare's play could very well be applied at this moment. Like Timon of Athens, the United States for a long time has contributed its resources and its wealth to erstwhile friends and allies. Fortunately, although we are not yet bankrupt, we have already learned the lesson that money cannot buy friends.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I supported the committee amendment and voted to report the bill as amended. During my 4 years here I have consistently supported mutual-security legislation. I intend to vote for this bill on passage, provided the House sustains the committee action which reduced the administration's request by \$1,109,000,000.

Some Members of this body are against the committee amendment only because the President objects to it. They cite his military genius and his leadership as their reasons for opposing the reduction. I welcome the advice of our leaders, but our leaders are not infallible; they are made of common clay just as you and I. The President has made mistakes in the past.

Most Members of this House have had more experience in Government than has our President, and regardless of whether or not he may be a military genius, as some claim—and that is debatable—I contend that your constituents and mine sent us here to follow the dictates of our own conscience and the course that our own judgment would suggest.

So, let us put aside this idle talk that we can disclaim the responsibility which is ours. This great committee held hearings over a period of 8 weeks, and in its wisdom concluded that this cut should be made.

The committee has cogent reasons for reducing the figure. For one thing, it is estimated that at the end of this fiscal year there will be an unexpended balance of approximately \$6.8 billion. Moreover, there will be about \$5 billion in the military pipeline. Even with the committee amendment reducing the figure by \$1,109,000,000, the authorization will yet be \$860 million greater than the appropriation last year. On top of these cogent reasons, may I cite the fact that the flexibility provisions in this bill make it possible for the President to transfer adequate funds to cover any contingencies that might develop.



Mr. Chairman, it can be recalled that the Congress has reduced the requests of the executive branch each year anywhere from \$6 million to \$1.9 billion, and each time these reductions have been made, protests were heard similar to those that are being voiced today. This year's appropriation is merely to perform an interim function. Why then should we have such a greatly increased authorization over the appropriation last year, when it is evident that we cannot be certain as to how we shall proceed with the program until after there has been a reevaluation?

One easily gets the impression that more funds are often requested than are necessary or than can be spent. Did the Comptroller General of the United States not accuse the ICA of overprogramming during his recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations? Did he not make the statement that that agency, which handles nonmilitary aid, has frequently asked Congress for more money than it could spend in the subsequent fiscal year? Was he not equally critical of the Defense Department's handling of funds for military aid?

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to throw aside the judgment of the committee, if we are going to disregard its findings and its recommendations based on 8 weeks of hearings and arduous study, and if we are just going to blindly acquiesce in the wishes of the executive branch, then the time has come when we ought to discharge this committee, admit that constitutional government no longer exists, fold up our tents and go home.

I went with my subcommittee last fall on a study mission, and in country after country I found that people seemingly have the wrong impression of our intentions and of the purposes of our foreign-aid program. Many of these people seem to think they are doing the United States a favor by accepting aid. In France I found that the people do not comprehend the threat of Russian aggression. The French nation appeared to me to be a decadent nation, no longer possessing the will, the determination, or the desire to resist a powerful aggressor. American money can never supply moral and spiritual purpose, and this is the foundation of a nation's strength.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has an estimated \$1 billion foreign-aid investment in Yugoslavia. Yet, Tito has responded to Russian overtures and debonairly accepted a hero's welcome in Moscow. He has promised that the Communist nations would never again be split and declared that the fates of Yugoslavia and Russia are inseparable.

Then there is Egypt. Did she not extend diplomatic recognition to Communist China on May 16?

And what about India? According to a statement in the February 6 issue of the Department of State Bulletin, since August 15, 1947, the date of India's independence, United States Government aid to India has totaled \$477,934,000. Of this total, more than half, or \$242,934,000 has been in the form of grants. The American people have shown their friendship for India. But is Nehru grateful? Is he a friend of the West? Is he really neutral?

Mr. Chairman, in the light of definite failures, shortcomings, and noncooperation on the part of some of our Allies, it is difficult for me to do other than to support the proposed reduction in the authorization. The attitude of fence-sitting, appeasement, and neutralism is so disappointing that I am approaching the time when I shall find it exceedingly difficult to go along with this program. Were it not for certain staunch Allies such as Turkey, Greece, Israel, Pakistan, Korea, and Formosa, and a few others, I would vote against this bill now, because after all our great contributions to victory and to rehabilitation after victory we have a right to expect wholehearted cooperation and a will to resist the common enemy.

Many of the beneficiary nations are currently enjoying higher living standards than ever. Some have balanced their budgets with the aid of our funds. They enjoy a greater prosperity than before World War II. Some of them have not hesitated to sacrifice principle and friendship in order to increase trade with the Reds. NATO nations have not built the defense force that was contemplated. The nations of Europe, generally speaking, act under a pall of fear and are afraid of drawing down the ire of the Soviets. Some of these same nations, which we now look upon as allies, may declare themselves neutral in order to avoid total destruction in an atomic war. In the final analysis, we can probably rely with assurance only upon our own country and our own people to fight any future war to a victorious climax. So, Mr. Chairman, I say, let us not be like Timon of Athens and learn the truth too late. Let us conserve our resources while there is yet time. Let us sustain the action of the committee in reducing the requested authorization, and it will be an exemplary lesson to our European friends and others throughout the world. It is the kind of thing they need to bring them to a realization that there is a limit to the patience of the American people and a limit to the resources of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I will vote for the pending bill provided the committee cut is sustained.

In conclusion, I want to pay tribute to my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. I have served with him on the committee for some time, and I have learned to respect his judgment and to love him. This is the last time that he will pilot the mutual-security bill through the House. His decision to retire after this year means that this House will lose the services of a great American. But he has left his impression, an indelible one, upon all the members of the committee and it is an impression that will never cease to make itself felt in the Halls of Congress.

I am confident that I speak the sentiments of all Members of this House when I say to my chairman, in the words of the poet:

The roses, red, upon my neighbor's vine  
Are owned by him, but they are also mine.  
His was the cost, and his the labor too,  
But mine, as well as his, the joy, their love-  
liness to view.

They bloom for me and are for me as fair  
As for the man who gives them all his care.  
Thus I am rich because a good man grew  
A rose-clad vine for all his neighbors view.  
I know from this that others plant for me  
That what they own, my joy may also be.  
So why be selfish when so much that's fine  
Is grown for me upon [DICK RICHARDS'] vine.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it appears that I will not be able to remain until the finish of this bill, but I would like for the RECORD to show that if I were present and voting, I would vote against the amendment and against the bill on final passage.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to be here yesterday during general debate because of illness. Quite frankly, I do not think I would be here today if it were not for the fact that I wanted publicly to pay tribute to my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. It has been a privilege and an honor and a great pleasure for me to serve under his always impartial and inspiring leadership. His absence next year is going to be regarded by all of us as a great loss not only to the Congress but to his State and Nation. We hope that he will enjoy many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, may I assure the distinguished chairman of the committee that only the most sincere motives compel me to take a position which is different from his on this particular bill. I am supporting the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS]. During the committee hearings I offered an amendment which would have reduced the military appropriations by about \$625 million. The effect of the Hays amendment will reduce the overall appropriation to a level which I considered justified and which apparently is acceptable to those charged with the responsibility for the defense of this country.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that none of us would place a price tag on freedom. Nor would we attempt to evaluate American rights in terms of dollars and cents, but I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that because of the confusion which surrounds the mutual-security program some of us may inadvertently be doing just that.

Now, what is the purpose of the program? To understand this I think we must recognize that we live in a very small world—a world in which man has developed weapons of such terrible destructive power that if we were to become involved in an atomic war, we are not even sure that any man, woman, or child on the face of the earth would survive.

So a principal objective of the program is to serve as a deterrent to war. At the present time there is no deterrent

to war except our capacity for retaliation, and until we have iron-clad controls which will make another war impossible, we have no alternative other than to rely upon military power as a principal means of preserving the peace.

We are not trying to buy friends. Everyone knows that that is impossible. We are not engaged in a huge giveaway program with all benefits accruing to the people of other nations. We are concerned with the security of the United States as well as that of our friends in the free world. And make no mistake about it, they are contributing a major share to the defense of freedom. Based on gross national product, I think you will find that many of these nations are making almost as great a contribution to the defense of the free world as we are, and, in a sense, a greater contribution because their resources are far smaller than ours.

A great deal has been said about the failure of this program since its inception. Of course, there have been failures. We have not achieved all our objectives, but neither have the Communists. We may be sure of one thing, however. The Communists are not going to let down in their effort to dominate the entire world. Unless we are willing to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary in support of our principles and ideas the future will indeed be bleak.

This is not a giveaway program. It is an integral part of our own national defense. I think the people of the country and many Members of Congress should be more cognizant of this fact. We are engaged in a great struggle to protect American freedom, and the freedom of people everywhere who want freedom.

This is a responsibility we must accept. The efforts of Communists to take over one country after another, piecemeal must be curbed not simply in the interest of these countries but in our own interest as well. For if we have to go it alone, without friends who will fight and help if the means are available to them, one cannot overestimate the seriousness of our own position as a Nation.

The mutual-security program has the unqualified support of our top military leaders and the President of the United States. Do we dare ignore the advice of such men as these on a matter of such vital importance to our national security?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, with the understanding that the Speaker of the House will have 10 minutes, the distinguished minority leader will have 10 minutes, and the chairman of the committee will have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RABAUT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, some time ago a similar situation arose and there were some 30 to 35 Members on the floor standing. A motion was offered that debate close in a period of time that would have allowed a minute or a minute and a half to each Member.

I gave notice at that time that if that procedure was attempted to be followed again, I intended to do everything I could to prevent the choking off or the gagging of Members of the House. I am going to do that. I am going to insist on it. Those who want to make arrangements for Friday may make them, but I do not want them to take Friday as a holiday at my expense.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want everybody to have whatever time they feel they need, but I think we should try to get along with this section. I am willing to amend my request to an hour and a half; that is, add 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have not relinquished by reservation of objection. I have another objection and that is that during general debate all day yesterday, committee members took most of that time. Today, at least in the last few minutes, at least 2 committee members asked and were given an additional 5 minutes to speak. I am not going along with any procedure which will cut the rest of us off from an opportunity to debate a bill of this kind.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman referred to the general debate we had yesterday. If the gentleman had been present, he could have had plenty of time, all the time he wanted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All the time he wanted? You did not have anybody here to listen to it, until I made the point of order that a quorum was not present. Does the gentleman think I want to talk to an empty House?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in an hour and a half, with the understanding as I stated that 10 minutes each be reserved to the Speaker, the minority leader, and the chairman of the committee. That will leave an hour for the other Members here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a reservation of time cannot be made in a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in an hour and a half, with the understanding that the Speaker, the minority leader, and the committee chairman be given time as I have suggested.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman, and make the same point of order that the gentleman made on that. He cannot do it that way.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, how much time does that leave for those who are not given preferential treatment under the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RICHARDS. If the Clerk will count the number of Members standing, outside of the three I have mentioned, we can see how many there will be.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 15 Members standing other than the 3 who have been designated with respect to time. That would give about 4 minutes apiece. Under that situation, is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 2 hours, under the stipulation I have just made as to time for the Speaker, the minority leader, and the committee chairman. That would be 5 minutes for every Member here who rose.

Mr. CANFIELD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does this have any effect on the discussion which will follow on the proposed amendment in regard to Tito?

Mr. RICHARDS. It has nothing in the world to do with that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the other members of my committee and the many Members of the House who are taking this opportunity to pay tribute to our retiring chairman, JAMES RICHARDS.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. RADWAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may extend their remarks in praise of the chairman at any point in the RECORD they may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, it is said that some men are born great, that some achieve greatness, and that some have greatness thrust upon them. I am not prepared to say which of these categories would apply to JIM RICHARDS, but I think we can all agree that when the gavel falls for adjournment of the present session, this legislative body will have lost the services of a great man. It has been my good fortune and privilege to have served with Chairman RICHARDS on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and to have received the benefit of his fine leadership. My best wishes go with him as he leaves us for greener pastures.

Mr. Chairman, it is because I hold JIM RICHARDS, our illustrious committee chairman, in such high esteem, that it is all the more difficult for me to disagree with him at this time. Yet I was among those who, in committee, supported President Eisenhower's original request, and I want to lend my support at this time to the Hays amendment which would restore a substantial portion of the cut made by our committee. JIM RICHARDS would be the last person to expect one of his colleagues to act contrary to his firm legislative convictions.

I have always believed in the wisdom of our mutual-security program. I most firmly believe today that this program has been a success from its inception under a Democratic President, to its present state of development under a Republican President. I mention this, Mr. Chairman, because I recognize no partisanship in the field of international affairs. That is why it had my sincere support under a Democratic President just as a great number of Democrats now support it under the leadership of President Eisenhower. I have accepted this pro-



gram because it coincides with my firm convictions. Even if it did not, I think I could still do so on faith. I speak of my faith in the leadership of the United States of America, and that leadership today is President Eisenhower. As that great American and distinguished Democrat, the illustrious Speaker of this House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, has pointed out, we have only one President of the United States. He is the voice of America, or we have no voice in the world.

This program is essential to our national security and well-being as a nation and could be justified solely on the basis of our own self-interest. If this program were a part of our defense budget, no Member here today would vote against it. Yet, who can deny that it is just as essential to the defense of this country as are the dollars which we have appropriated for defense this year? It is an absolute fact that the money which we include here for foreign military aid represents a present and future saving in our defense budget. It could just as well be appropriated under the heading of defense. At the present time, we have only 2 divisions in Korea, compared with 6 a few years ago. Why? Simply because the Koreans themselves now have some 20 divisions in the field thanks to our aid and help.

It is as simple as that. It costs us far, far less to equip a Korean soldier in Korea, or a Turkish soldier in Turkey, to hold the line against Soviet communism, than it does to wrench an American boy from his family, and send him off to some foreign land, at the end of a supply line thousands of miles long. The foreign military aid requested by this administration would support about 200 divisions in the armies of our cooperating allies. That is many times the strength of the American Army. Yet those who would cut that request of President Eisenhower today, are the very ones who express great fear that our defense budget is being too drastically curtailed. The fact is that if we were to eliminate \$2 billion in foreign military aid this year, our defense budget would have to go up at least \$6 billion. You cannot "rob Peter to pay Paul". Neither can those who express fear that our foreign military aid program is too large, and that our defense appropriations are too small, blow out of both sides of their mouths at the same time.

President Eisenhower is not only our present Commander in Chief, but he led us to victory in the greatest war in history. I do not follow him slavishly when I suggest that his recommendations are entitled to great weight.

There is no lessening in world tension. Everyone agrees that we must remain strong to survive. We are alarmed that some of our European friends feel that the Soviet military threat has ended. Yet there are those who would encourage them in that belief by cutting down the military program for Europe to the point where it cannot operate.

The \$600 million which Representative HAYS would restore to this bill by his amendment is a lot of money, by any standard. But measure it against the productiveness of this Nation and our faith that it will survive and flourish.

That sum is only fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of our gross national production. And we do not offer it in a world-destroying war. We are asked to appropriate it as a deterrent to war. On that basis alone, it is justified. Add to this, the overseas markets we create for our own products, with resultant prosperity in our own land, and add to this the strength we provide to those underdeveloped nations which would otherwise fall prey to Russian communism, and the arguments against the President's recommendations must fall.

The peace of the world and the welfare of those peoples allied with us in an effort to resist the aims of world communism cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

In brief gentlemen, passage of the Hays amendment is essential to the future security of our country.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the recent statement by Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank, that the United States had won a great "tactical and diplomatic victory" in persuading Premier Nasser, of Egypt, to accept Uncle Sam's offer of a gift of \$200 million to start the famous Aswan Dam on the Nile River is the subject of comment today.

At the same time our Government was negotiating with Egypt's Premier to give away \$200 million of American taxpayers' money to start the world's largest dam, with a promise of loans of additional hundreds of millions to assure its ultimate completion, while western Oklahoma and other nearby States were experiencing severe dust storms, droughts, and serious water shortages, rain finally came recently accompanied by flash floods.

It will be of little consolation to Oklahoma farmers, who in the past have been hauling water for their livestock, to know that their Government has won this so-called diplomatic victory in the form of magnanimous handouts to Egypt. Egyptian farmers along the Nile managed to finance and construct their own dams many centuries before this Nation was born. No doubt farmers of the Nile Valley could use more water. But so could Oklahoma farmers, who are helping pay the bill. They do not want charity, but only an opportunity to help themselves.

I have, therefore, introduced in Congress several bills for the construction of 11 additional irrigation, reclamation, and flood-control projects and several upstream Soil Conservation Service projects in western Oklahoma that, when completed, will cost only a fractional part of the outright gift of \$200 million plus the loans that may ultimately cost \$1,300,000,000, which is the estimated cost of Egypt's dam. These Oklahoma projects will not only help fill our urgent need for irrigation, reclamation, flood-control and upstream detention dams but will supply much-needed water for several Oklahoma towns. These towns and cities are not asking for a handout, but will pay back all loans for that part of such projects in connection with water supply.

I have requested that our two able Senators join me.

I will add that I expect to continue my fight for flood control, irrigation, and reclamation and upstream soil conservation projects similar to the Sandstone Creek, Branitz Creek, and other Soil Conservation Service projects on the Washita, as well as agricultural conservation practices such as terracing, contouring, green manure, crops, deep plowing, plowing under legumes, and so forth, as practiced by the ASC at home for the benefit of American farmers and other tax-burdened American citizens, rather than waste American dollars in a bold but futile attempt to buy Egypt's friendship under the guise of a diplomatic victory.

Mr. Chairman, since Marshal Tito is leaning toward Russia now, the administration should reconsider its loan policy and now "veto Tito."

I am voting with the committee to reduce the original request by \$600 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, that there may be no misunderstanding, permit me to join in all the commendatory statements that have been made or which will be made dealing with the wonderful service which has been rendered by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. RICHARDS.

Mr. Chairman, it may be assumed that some of us have no knowledge of medical treatment. It must also be assumed that the ordinary individual has some knowledge of what is good for one's health and for the recovery of anyone who is afflicted with sickness. Assume you had a son and a daughter. That the son had some infection in his foot and it became necessary, in the opinion of the physician who was a well-qualified gentleman, to give a transfusion of blood. Assume the physician kept on giving blood transfusions for a long, long time, but the infection kept going up and up the leg and the son kept getting worse. That the physician has taken so much of the blood of the daughter that she began to fade away and it appeared that both, if the treatment was continued, would be in the hands of the undertaker. What would you do? Would you get another doctor? Would you change the remedy?

It would occur to me that, while the recovery of the son was of tremendous importance, a justifiable apprehension that the daughter might be bled to death—as some rumors insist was the cause of the death of the father of our country, George Washington—his physicians repeatedly bled him—would come to mind.

While I might still have confidence in the physician or physicians who were treating them, I would at least begin to inquire as to whether blood transfusions were the proper remedy. If I had confidence in the physician I might not discharge him but I might suggest that my commonsense told me that perhaps the physician should take a look at some other remedy, at some other procedure.

There is no question but that our President is one of the greatest military experts in the world. Concede that. But what does he know about where a tax dollar comes from? Did he ever lack

food, clothing, or shelter because he did not have the money with which to purchase it? Was he ever forced to practice strict thrift in order to provide for his future?

Great as is my respect for the President and his judgment, knowing from experience the value of a dollar and how the average individual earns that dollar, and the necessity, if he is to survive and live under the American standard, that a certain part of it must be reserved for his own use, it occurs to me that perhaps the President—wise as he may be, and we will say is—has just simply forgotten, or never knew accurately the extent of the ability of the American people to produce, just how much of what they produce they must retain if our economic machinery is to be oiled, greased, kept running, and, when obsolete, replaced. He is not, in my judgment, getting a complete picture of the whole situation. He is a specialist, and like all specialists, places altogether too much stress upon one phase of the situation which today confronts us.

No one questions the sincerity of the President. No one questions but that he is convinced that the better way to prepare for national defense, to stop the spread of communism, is the adoption of this present bill.

But again permit me to call attention to the fact which so many forget, that while the President has had a wide and a varied experience in other countries, and we might add, throughout the world, while he commanded in World War II, so far as can be recalled, since the day when he graduated with honors at West Point, he has never had the experience of earning his own livelihood with his muscles, through sweat, and the accumulation of calluses.

Do not misunderstand. There is no thought that as a military man he has not worked hard, conscientiously, and ably for the sum which the taxpayers have paid him or that he did not earn each dollar that he received.

There is no question but that our Secretary of State is a learned man of wide travel throughout the world. He has had a world of experience in foreign affairs. He belongs to a group in New York which has made fabulous sums—legitimately, honestly, and honorably. Is there any reason why that should not affect his thinking? That of his associates? None at all.

The training of our Secretary of State undoubtedly influences his decisions. This is said without any questioning of his motives or his sincerity. Having been a lawyer in the East and having among his clients many whose interests are abroad, and no doubt the representatives of some foreign governments seeking aid, a considerable portion of his legal business coming from those who are interested in aid of all kinds to other countries, it is inevitable that consciously or unconsciously his views should be influenced by his clients and by those with whom over the years he has associated. Hence, he, too, has difficulty in seeing the need for a change in our foreign policy.

And so we have someone in the Department giving us advice and telling

us what to do and how to treat communism who again does not know anything about how you dig dollars out of the dirt, how you earn them in the factory, how you accumulate them in business. Nevertheless, they are telling us how to spend our money.

So, assuming that I know nothing about foreign policy, how to treat this disease called communism, nevertheless I do know something about from whence comes the money to meet these appropriations. I do know how people work day after day and week after week to save a little for the future.

Our colleague from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, spent many years in China rendering—we are told—a great humanitarian service. He is said to be an expert on foreign affairs, especially in the field of our dealings with Asia and her people. If memory serves correctly, he has always advocated the giving of what might be termed our lifeblood, that is, our natural resources, to other countries. It seems to some of us that, at times, in making this financial transfusion, he has tapped not a vein but an artery, and, to some, a large and vital one.

Just as there is a limit to the amount of blood which can be drawn from a donor, there is a limit to what may be safely drained from the financial and economic resources of a nation.

I admire very very much our great colleague from Minnesota. For 20 years he devoted his life to helping the Chinese, a wonderful humanitarian service. There is no question about that; none at all. Now he comes along and he is prescribing what is, he thinks, good for the country here at home when he knows comparatively little about what was happening here in the many long years he was in China—well, I should change that and say not too much or at least not all of what was happening while he was serving in China.

His hobby is helping the Chinese and the nations of Asia, a fine laudable Christian purpose, but I do not want him to cut my throat, figuratively speaking, nor the throats of our people while he is prescribing billions of dollars to cure the sickness of China or other nations.

There is a limit:

True, we are a great and a powerful nation. But, when our foreign-aid program and the operations of our Federal Government take from an overwhelming majority of our taxpayers at least a third of their income; when the people of America as a group are forced to give 4 months of their working time each year to meet the demands of their Government, it occurs to some of us that the time to change our foreign policy has arrived.

This is especially true when, as our colleague from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, will admit, and as others are constantly reminding us, the countries we have so generously and continuously aided have been and are drifting into the arms of our enemy.

The world's cancer, communism, instead of yielding to treatment, has, we are told, been growing ever larger. More and more countries have fallen under Russia's influence, and, as they fell, and we have a very recent example, they have

taken with them into the Communist-controlled orbit much, if not most, of the assistance which we have given them.

So the gentleman goes along and he asks us to go along with the State Department and with its policy, and where is he getting? And who is actually formulating our State Department policy? Let us take a look at that question.

Just a few days ago, testifying before a Senate committee, he told us in substance that the policy of the State Department, while it bore the imprint of the Secretary of State and perhaps of a few of his top assistants, was actually formulated and made by those in the Department of State who, down in the lower ranks, collected, evaluated, and passed on the information upon which the Secretary and his assistants acted.

Then our colleague, testifying before that committee, added that many of those who so collected, compiled, and evaluated this information and upon which the Secretary of State formulated his policy, were leftwingers, were all too often advocates of near-Communist doctrine.

So, from our own House expert on the affairs of the East and on foreign policy, we have this strange, illogical statement that we should continue to follow the policy of the State Department, apparently approved as it is by the President, even though that policy was the result of the suggestions and the advice of individuals who were swayed by and had accepted communistic teachings.

An absurdity on its face. As well, might I—watching at the bedside of my son and my daughter, seeing both weakening, because of the original infection in the son and the blood transfusions from the daughter, knowing that both were on the way to an appointment with the undertaker, advocate a continuance of the blood transfusions, no different treatment for the infection.

What has been said may sound crude. It does, however, illustrate why my present convictions are entertained.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. You have had ample time.

Mr. JUDD. I think in fairness the gentleman should yield. Look at the transcript.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have had the press reports and, in my judgment, have given a fair and accurate summation of what the gentleman said on the point to which I am making reference.

The gentleman has taken much of the time given to the discussion of this bill. You have had plenty of time in which to advocate your philosophy, to justify your position.

So what is the result? Just look at the logic in his argument. He says that Mr. Dulles makes the policy and to make the policy he accepts the information collected and evaluated by these under boys whom the gentleman said—if he did not say they were Communists he came pretty close to it—were Pinks. So we have the policy of the State Department based on the opinion of these employees down below who are to a certain extent disloyal to their country, yet the



gentleman asks us to follow the policy which they originate which comes to us through Dulles.

We have reached the limit.

To other countries since July 1940 and until December 31, 1955, we have made available over \$111 billion, either in funds, munitions of war, or military and economic aid. We are today told there is on hand, available and unexpended for national defense, some \$5 billion. This bill asks us to give an additional four billion, nine hundred million to add to that sum.

As was advocated by our learned, intensely patriotic colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] and others on his committee who agreed with him, and by many Members of the House, it is time—it is long past time—for us to consider some remedy for preventing the spread of communism, some defense to meet its aggression, other than the stripping of ourselves of the ability to maintain our economic freedom and to meet any armed assault which may come.

Throughout the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and I assume the situation is somewhat similar elsewhere, those who are not under the present law on social security, are complaining and insisting upon being brought under the law. Veterans and their dependents are demanding ever increasing billions to relieve their distress.

People of middle age who cannot, because of competition by machines and youthful workers, obtain jobs; who, through no fault of their own, are unable to provide themselves with the necessities of life—food, shelter, and clothing—are entitled to relief.

To me it seems that all of these demands should be given consideration and where possible granted, before we continue to pour our sustenance out to the people of other nations who in return desert us, accept the political philosophy of the Communists.

Because of the present situation, because of the failure of the program which we have heretofore followed, my convictions will not permit me to go along with this present bill, even though I would like to support the administration, and this being an election year, to yield to its demands.

I want no part of a policy or of a philosophy which originates, as our colleague from Minnesota has testified, from subordinates in the State Department who—I think it fair to conclude from his testimony—do not believe in the American system of government, who pass on biased, prejudiced statements in favor of some communistic doctrine, which unwittingly, unconsciously is accepted and handed to us through the Secretary of State.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, even those of us who have long believed and who have always supported foreign aid in the interests of our country have today great misgivings about this particular bill and these particular requests. Some of them stem directly from the fact that we have seen a failure in many places of the

moneys which have been appropriated by this Congress toward the stopping of the march of communism.

I would particularly draw attention at this time to the failures that are now occurring in the Near East or the Middle East. I would like to draw attention to the committee report specifically. For instance, on page 13 of the committee report it is stated that there is now in the pipeline for the Near East and Africa \$598,149,000. This was as of last November. And it is stated that the Defense Department was not able to provide a more current regional breakdown of the pipeline figures. I wonder why they were not able to give us a more accurate figure or more information. One of the things which makes it difficult for us to support this program is exactly this lack of accurate information.

Then, again, on page 15 you will find that there is a figure of \$170 million appropriated under this bill for the Near East and Africa. It does not say how it is divided up. It is stated that this is classified information. But, Mr. Chairman, there is this, to me, a very disturbing sentence in the committee report:

The amounts for certain countries are omitted because the executive branch regards them as classified.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the committee, Does this mean that we are pledged to continue to give money and arms to the Arab States who in recent days and in recent times have indicated they are playing the Russian game?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Did the gentleman hear my speech of a few hours ago in which I pointed out that the Pentagon had money in the bill for two more Arab States for military assistance that had not had it before? When we called this to their attention they stated that was a mistake. What they are asking you to do is to take it on faith and they will give it to whoever they want to after we vote it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If that is the answer of the committee, we must all be greatly disturbed, because the record in the United Nations in the last few days I think without any question proves that we are losing the battle in the Middle East and that little by little Russia is having its way in lining up the Middle Eastern countries to use our money against our own country. It certainly seems incongruous as it must to the rest of the world when the one nation which has been friendly to us, which has stood up and worked for democracy, and who has been our friend, is denied aid while we hand it to the countries that in the United Nations refused to admit the basic fact of the existence of the State of Israel which we in the United States did so much to bring about.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether any member of the committee will clarify this in the future or not, but I hope they will. For if that is typical of the way in which the moneys of the Ameri-

can people are being spent, then I think this Congress must take a much closer look at what is going on.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly take the floor at this time to record my misgivings over the course of events in the Near East.

Communist forces have seized the initiative in this strategic area. More than 9 months have passed since the Communist bloc started shipping arms to Egypt. They are using the Arab States to further their own propaganda to weaken the prestige and to undermine the defense of the free world. But the West has not yet developed an effective plan to meet the danger.

Within the last few days, we have witnessed a most extraordinary spectacle of Communist hypocrisy at the United Nations Security Council. What happened there has dramatically exposed the Kremlin's fraudulent peace offensive and has shown that the danger to the free world has mounted because we have failed to take vigorous and effective counter-measures.

I refer to the debate which took place on a resolution introduced by the United Kingdom to empower the Secretary-General of the United Nations to continue his efforts in the Middle East to secure compliance with the Arab-Israel U. N. armistice agreements. The resolution originally expressed hope for a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis.

These words had special significance. On April 17, Mr. Molotov, then U. S. S. R. Foreign Minister, had used these identical words in a press conference in Moscow. Many people were surprised—but pleased—to hear them because he seemed to be saying that the Kremlin wanted to help bring about an Arab-Israel peace, despite its arms shipments to Egypt.

The statement later appeared in the joint communique issued by Prime Minister Eden and Premier Bulganin in London on April 27.

But when these words were used in the British resolution at the U. N. Security Council last week, indignant protests came from Arab delegates who shouted their opposition to any kind of peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis and instead called for the liquidation of Israel.

The U. S. S. R. delegation then quickly bowed to the Arab will and joined in the demand for removal of the offensive words, notwithstanding their Communist authorship.

I regret that the Western powers yielded to the pressure of the anti-peace coalition of the Soviet-Arab axis. The words were removed. As adopted, the resolution has little meaning. But the debate had sinister implications because it revealed very plainly that the Arab States have grown bolder in their outrageous clamor for Israel's disappearance.

Moreover, the U. S. S. R. is now unmasked as insincere and hypocritical. Anxious to pursue the Arabs, it is ready to repudiate its own undertakings as a peace-loving member of the U. N. Its words have no meaning for honest men.

They are cynical camouflage for an unremitting conspiracy against freedom.

Mr. Chairman, this experience demonstrates, above all, that our Government dares not rely on the U. S. S. R. as a partner to promote and preserve the peace in the Middle East. If the administration thought it could avert the rising danger and prevent war in the region by resort to United Nations machinery, it was dangerously deluding itself. For as much as we believe in the United Nations and support that body, we must face the unpleasant reality that action on the Arab-Israel conflict is always impeded and blocked by the perennial threat of a Soviet veto.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the House to editorials on this affair which appeared in the New York Times of June 2 and June 5 and the Washington Post of June 6.

I shall include them at the conclusion of my remarks.

In the light of what happened last week, the administration must take a new and harder look at its own policy in the Middle East.

It may be that the administration has some secret grand strategy to counteract the military imbalance resulting from the Communist arms shipments and their propagandist and subversive conspiracy with some of the Arab leaders.

But if there is such a strategy, it has not been revealed to us. On the contrary, there is a widespread impression that we are not ready and that we are relying largely on hope. The administration has not yet taken any action to implement the Tripartite Declaration of 1950. There is a growing fear that the administration has walked away from the commitments in that declaration. I hope that this is not true. But I wish the administration would give us some positive reassurance.

Early in the year, I thought of offering some kind of legislative program which would reaffirm our determination to stand behind the declaration of 1950, to make it absolutely clear to any potential aggressor in the Near East that we are determined to preserve the U. N. armistice lines and that we will not permit any dangerous arms discrepancy.

But it seemed premature and presumptuous for an individual Congressman to attempt a solution of a problem that was taxing the interests and energies of the Department of State and the members of the congressional committees charged with the problem.

I had hoped that some concrete program might be developed under the Mutual Security Act. I regret that there is not a word in the bill which suggests any recognition of the danger or promises any action to meet it.

The administration is here asking for more money for arms for the Middle East. The testimony shows that the administration plans to provide additional arms to Iraq. A special study mission of the House Foreign Affairs Committee tells us on page 52 of a recent report that "as a member of the Arab League, Iraq opposed the creation of the State of Israel, participated in the war against that state and is still technically at war with her."

It is idle for the administration to explain that Iraq has no common frontier with Israel. The lack of a common frontier did not prevent Iraq from invading Israel in 1948. Furthermore, the report of the committee to which I have just referred shows that the administration offered to give arms to Egypt in July 1953; it offered to give arms to Saudi Arabia in January 1953; it has sold arms to Egypt and it is selling arms to Saudi Arabia now.

Now I am not going to vote against this bill because of the arms shipments to Iraq, despite any reservations that I might have about sending arms to any Arab country in advance of an Arab-Israel peace.

I do ask, however, how the administration can possibly claim to be fair, friendly and impartial in the Middle East when it donates arms to Iraq, a country which can afford to buy them with its substantial income in oil royalties, and at the same time refuse to act on Israel's request for arms which was first submitted more than 4 years ago. From the very moment that the Communists began shipping arms to Israel's hostile neighbors, to Egypt and now to Syria, we should have been ready to meet that challenge by supplying arms to Israel. Of course, none of us like an arms race, but we must not allow the Communists to win an arms runaway at the expense of a little country in the Near East which stands firmly committed to democracy and Western civilization. Let us for once support our proven friends.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard the argument that if we allow Israel to get arms from us, it may throw the Arab countries into the arms of the Russians, and that we must do nothing that might in any way irritate or provoke the Arabs into that kind of maniacal suicide. But that reasoning is dangerous because of its implications. Does it mean that we will abandon friends any time any country threatens to go Communist? Is this the way to promote democracy in the Middle East? Can we make any impression on the uncommitted millions of the Middle East and Asia, can we win their allegiance to democracy and freedom, if we allow a little democracy to become an expendable hostage to Communist conspiracy and Arab blackmail?

Is there any wonder our prestige and friends are vanishing?

Mr. Chairman, I am also familiar with the indirect approach to this military problem, which is to let our allies provide arms to Israel while we remain aloof so that we can preserve some kind of independent status as a peacemaker. I don't think this tactic deceives anybody, because the Arab states blame us for anything our allies do. They will be satisfied with nothing less than Israel's complete isolation. Furthermore, I do not believe that we can come into the Middle East in the role of an impartial peacemaker if we have offered and supplied arms to one side and refused them to the other. We cease to be impartial when we are immobilized by Arab threats. The result of our inertia is that we have whetted Arab appetites for greater and greater concessions at

Israel's expense while the Russians supply them with the weapons to carry out their hostile plans.

Mr. Chairman, we will not meet the Communist threat to the Near East by wishing it were not there, by burying our heads in the scrap pile of expurgated resolutions at the U. N., by accepting Communist protestations even as they are recanting them.

The exhibition at the U. N. last week shows that the situation has deteriorated. The Middle East is further from peace than at any time since 1948. I believe that this is due largely to Communist maneuver and conspiracy. But I also believe that it is partly due to a failure on the part of the West to respond to the threat firmly and effectively.

I hope that the administration will soon take a more realistic and decisive position. Surely the debate at the Security Council argues for a policy which says what it means, says it firmly and vigorously, and then moves forward to carry it out.

[From the New York Times of June 2, 1956]

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT PALESTINE

The United Nations Security Council has been spending some tedious hours this week wrestling with the wording of a British resolution that expressed hope for a lasting peace in Palestine. The delay that kept the Council working overtime was due mainly to the reluctance of the Arab states—Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt—to admit that the State of Israel legally exists and to give up, for good and all, their ambition to drive the Israelis into the Mediterranean. For this reason the discussion yesterday, still incomplete, was postponed until Monday afternoon.

Not one Arab speaker said one word to indicate that he felt the awful responsibility of restoring or maintaining peace in the Near East; not one showed the slightest understanding, or desire to understand, the urge that drove so many abused and harassed individuals into the ancient land of Palestine, to set up a new commonwealth and labor for a new hope; not one welcomed the kind of peace that might result from accepting Israel as a neighbor; each, without exception, seemed to be waiting for the ultimate catastrophe that by wrecking the Mediterranean world, and perhaps all the Western World, might destroy the tiny State of Israel.

These assertions are not rhetorical. The fault the Arabs found with the original British resolution was that it used words suggesting, however vaguely, that a peaceful and permanent settlement of the trouble between Israel and her Arab neighbors might be reached. The Arab spokesmen wouldn't have this. They regarded it as an offense for the United Nations to endorse, or the Secretary General to attempt, any solution that might put an end to the suffering and suspense in the Near East and open the way to peace and prosperity for all. They stuck to medieval notions that are now as out of date as chain armor, spears, and battleaxes.

Listen to the Syrian spokesman, Ambassador Ahmed Shukairy, speaking Thursday afternoon. He referred to Palestine—that is, the State of Israel, recognized by our own and most other governments, received in 1949 as a member of the United Nations—as "part and parcel of the Arab homeland." He went on to say:

"To advocate the idea of a mutually acceptable solution must inevitably lead to a reversal of all the resolutions of the United Nations. . . . We must begin from the beginning. We must start de novo on a clean sheet. Everything written by the United Nations should be written off, ever since



November 29, 1947. [This was the date of the U. N. partition resolution.] The establishment of Israel, its membership in the United Nations and all other resolutions will have to be revoked. Then, and then only, the United Nations can look forward to a solution "on a mutually acceptable basis."

We have to put this remarkable utterance into the context of a debate over Mr. Hammarskjöld's patient and impartial efforts to stop the killing in the Near East. Mr. Hammarskjöld reported, as in duty bound. He had kept—so it seemed to most observers—within the limits of the April 4 resolution, under which he had gone to Palestine. He had received assurances from all the parties, the four Arab States necessarily included, that they would try to reduce border squabbles and accept an increased and improved measure of U. N. supervision. There is every indication that the Arab States and Israel gave the assurances in good faith. But if we judge by the Arab arguments in the Security Council this week this good faith was in the Arab case of a temporary nature. Given an opportunity, one had to conclude, the Arabs would pounce on Israel.

Neither side in the Near Eastern troubles has been without blame. Each side has unnecessarily taken innocent lives. But the Israelis are now willing to settle and end the bloodshed. The Arabs, if their spokesmen truly represented them this week, are not ready to do this finally and for all time.

[From the New York Times of June 5, 1956]

#### U. N. HAS A BAD DAY

The United Nations and the Security Council never seemed weaker than they did yesterday when the Council allowed four Arab States, aided and abetted by Russia, to take out of the Palestine resolution the words that expressed hope for "a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis."

The Arab States, for which Syria was the most vociferous spokesman, were at least consistent; they have not concealed their desire to get rid of the little State of Israel, which, though they outnumber it 20 times over, they pretend to fear.

The United Kingdom and the United States were not inconsistent, either. They yielded in the interests of "unanimity," and achieved it—a mistaken course, we think, but not an ignoble one. But what is, or ever was, wrong with a "mutually acceptable settlement" in place of bloodshed and hate?

The Soviet Union, denouncing Stalin, as its new rulers are now doing, behaved as that dead and dishonored potentate would have done. On April 17, in Moscow, in a press conference sponsored by Vyacheslav M. Molotov, who was then Foreign Minister, they appealed for "a stable, peaceful settlement of the Palestine question on a mutually acceptable basis." The words were picked up and again endorsed by Russia in the joint communiqué issued by Prime Minister Eden and Premier Bulganin on April 27. Sir Pierson Dixon, British Ambassador to the U. N., certainly had every reason but one to believe that if he put them in his resolution the Russians would accept them. The one reason he overlooked was that Moscow is seemingly as ready as ever to betray its promises and assurances for a brief and mean diplomatic advantage.

And perhaps it is not even an advantage. Perhaps this episode will show skeptics, by contrast, that honor, courage and pity are in the end winning qualities. Perhaps the U. N. will be the stronger if this one act of folly opens its eyes to the eternal truth that empty compromises win no victories, and that in the end principles worth defending must be defended.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 6, 1956]

#### AGREEMENT ON AN ILLUSION

Unanimity on the next steps in the Middle East dispute has been purchased in the United Nations at the expense of a resolution so watered down as to be almost meaningless. The Security Council resolution finally filtered through the Arab and Soviet objections, authorizes Secretary General Hammarskjöld to continue his good offices to obtain compliance with the 1949 armistice, but pointedly omits any reference to settlement. In effect, Mr. Hammarskjöld will be permitted to urge peace as an objective so long as he avoids all mention of specific means for bringing real peace about.

The performance of the Arab States in the U. N. debate set something of a new low. The Arab delegates persistently refused to acknowledge the fact of Israel. Syria established the pattern by asserting that Israel was really a southern extension of Syria. The Syrian Ambassador to the U. N. also insisted that all U. N. actions on Palestine must be reversed and Israel, in effect, be legislated out of existence—a logical companion piece to the disgusting television performance in which the Syrian Ambassador in Washington demanded the erection of a screen between himself and the Israeli Ambassador.

But this performance, while deplorable, was not surprising. What made the difference was the capricious Soviet support of the Arab position. The deleted section of the British resolution, citing consciousness "of the need to create conditions in which a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis" would be possible, was adapted almost word for word from the Eden-Bulganin communiqué at the conclusion of the Soviet visit to London. Have the Russians now repudiated their announced willingness to work for stabilization in the Middle East? Does their continued whetting of Arab intransigence mean that they want a little peace but not too much?

Their tactics on the British resolution certainly would indicate as much. That being the case, the question is whether an essentially phony agreement has not been purchased at a high price, and whether it might not have been better for the Western powers to hoist the Russians on the inconsistency of their own words.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the well-deserved tribute which has been paid to the highly esteemed chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Hon. JAMES P. RICHARDS. I, too, was very sorry when I learned of his decision to retire from Congress. He is a man of great ability, integrity, and honesty. His adept handling of foreign affairs legislation has earned him a reputation which is known throughout the world. He has served the people of his district, his State, and his country with distinction, and will be greatly missed by this House, but his wise counsel and leadership will be long remembered.

Mr. Chairman, since my election to Congress, I have supported the mutual-security program because I believe that it is necessary to the defense and security of the American people and an essential factor in our fight against the increasing spread of international communism. However, when you look around the

world today, it makes you wonder if our money is being spent wisely. Under the present administration our foreign policy has been totally inept and vacillating to such an extent that America is now losing its position of world leadership. We have lost friends all over the globe. Looking around the world we find the state of tension in the Middle East, uprisings in Cyprus, Formosa is in danger of being bombed by Red China, things are not running smoothly in Korea, Cyprus is a hotbed, Vietnam is a state of chaos.

Mr. Chairman, I have followed with growing apprehension the weakness of our foreign policy in countering the effects of Soviet penetration of the Middle East. We have been weakly on the defensive ever since the Communist bloc began to send millions of dollars of jet planes and modern arms to Egypt. The hopes for peace that were raised when we initiated the United Nations mission of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld to the Middle East have been dashed by our acceptance of the recent U. N. resolution on the Middle East. This has been rendered meaningless by the connivance of the Soviet Union and the Arab States to eliminate the paragraph calling for a mutually acceptable settlement, between the Arabs and Israel. The fact that the Soviet Union yielded to Arab demands and repudiated its own language, which it formulated with Great Britain, should be proof to us that we cannot count on that state for cooperation in working toward peace in the Middle East.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union is continuing to send arms to the Middle East and is reported to have negotiated an agreement to send Syria over \$25 million worth of Soviet-bloc arms. This administration says it wants to preserve peace in the Middle East, yet our country, too, is contributing to the arms race by arming Iraq and including that country in this mutual-security program for additional arms. This will probably stimulate additional shipments by the Communists to Egypt and perhaps other Arab countries, and thus further upset the arms balance to Israel's disadvantage and danger.

The tiny State of Israel is the Western World's bulwark against the atheistic forces of Communism in the Middle East. Therefore, is it not natural and proper for us—as good Americans—to aid and assist our sister republic in that important part of the world?

How can we continue to refuse to send arms to Israel on the ground that we are opposed to an arms race, when at the same time we send arms to Iraq and Saudi Arabia? It does not make sense.

I quote from page 9 of the report on the bill we are considering: "The Committee was reassured both on and off the record that the program does not include any money or plans for military aid to Israel or to the Arab States bordering on Israel." The claim that Iraq does not border on Israel is a specious one. Iraq invaded Israel in 1948 and it has never ceased to hurl threats of war and invasion against Israel. Nevertheless, we are rewarding Iraq for her role in the Baghdad Pact and we are continuing to send

her millions of dollars of arms at the expense of the American taxpayers, although she is well able to pay for these weapons out of the vast proceeds that she receives for her oil.

What we have gained by this one-sided application of our policy of so-called impartial friendship is difficult to understand. Our course in the Middle East should be devoted to the strengthening of Israel as a democratic force capable of deterring aggression, blocking Communist penetration and staving off war by allowing her to obtain here the arms that she needs for her defense. We must make crystal clear to the Arab States that in the interests of freedom and democracy we will permit no aggression against Israel. Only then will it be possible to enter the long path that will result in a just peace for all.

I note in the press that the President says he will reevaluate certain phases of our foreign policy. The bill we are considering here today is an authorization bill. In a few weeks we will receive the appropriation bill containing funds to carry out the Mutual Security program. I hope that when this money bill reaches us, it will not contain any funds for arms to Egypt and the Arab countries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a few observations and comments on certain statements that have been made. A few moments ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] called attention to the activities of the State Department. Apparently the State Department has its nose in about everything that goes on in Washington. Witness the fact that that not long ago when the farm bill went through the Senate a Member took the floor and said he was offering three amendments on behalf of the State Department and, furthermore, that the State Department had instructed him to obtain rollcalls on each of the three amendments. The State Department is trying to run the affairs of this Congress, the Pentagon, the farmers, and every other department and agency of Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is going to be interesting this afternoon to find out just how many coattail riders we have in the House of Representatives; to see how fast that population increases. I am for the Bentley amendment to cut this bill, and I want no part of any coattail riding procedure here this afternoon. I will certainly support the committee cut if the Bentley amendment fails.

I have been interested in the fact that at last the businessmen of this country seem to be awakening to the insidiousness of this multibillion-dollar foreign-aid program. The other day I came across a bulletin entitled "Federal Spending Facts," issued by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Incidentally, the Texas Chamber of Commerce is a member as well as the Chamber of Commerce of Indiana. I am not sure about Massachusetts. Let me quote briefly from this bulletin with respect to this foreign give-away bill. And, when I say "giveaway" I am using the language of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]

as found in the hearings. Let me quote an excerpt or two from that bulletin:

In a report on overseas economic operations submitted to Congress a year ago by the Hoover Commission, a majority of the Commission expressed concern with the continuing large outlays for foreign aid. . . . They concluded their separate statement in these words:

"Surely, after almost 10 years, the time has come to apply some brakes to this overseas spending program. We believe, therefore, that the Commission should recommend substantial reductions in expenditures for this purpose. By no other means will the growing trend toward permanent foreign spending be halted."

That is from the Hoover Commission. The Council of State Chambers of Commerce says further under the title "Best Hope for Curtailment Is Congressional Action":

Certainly there is no reason to believe that any real moves to curtail foreign-aid spending will emanate from the bureaucrats who administer the program. Such action simply is not in the cards because the bureaucrat is rare indeed who finds reasons and offers recommendations for abolishing jobs.

Accordingly, large-scale foreign aid is likely to burden the American taxpayer for years to come unless Congress assumes the full responsibility of cutting it off.

No truer words have been written.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] spoke of the expenditures for defense by foreign governments as compared with their national gross products, and he said that many foreign countries were spending almost as much as we are. Well, what are some of the figures? We are spending 11 percent of our national gross product for defense. Belgium and Luxembourg, 4.5 percent, Holland, 5.9 percent, Denmark, 3.2 percent, France, only 7.8 percent, although they are in a war, Turkey 5.7 percent, and Spain, 4.3 percent.

Incidentally, I want to call attention to the hearings on this bill. I have read these hearings, and I find that Congress is operating more and more in a vacuum. You will find on almost every page—at least every other page—a dozen off the record discussions and security deletions. Let me read you one of the deletions for alleged security reasons:

Mr. VORYS. I was asked by a young student yesterday whether it was true that the French divisions in Algeria (security deletion) are armed with American arms and using American ammunition in putting down the rebellion there. I got to thinking. I said, "I don't know where else they have gotten any arms except from the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Here is a question asked by a young student and there is even a security deletion in his question. That is what you have to contend with when you read these hearings. If you can get

any real facts out of them, you are better than I am, believe me.

Going back to the figures on national gross product spent for defense, Greece, 6.3 percent; Italy, 4.4 percent. Only one country exceeds the expenditures of the United States out of the gross national product for defense, and that is Yugoslavia. Dictator Tito spends 11.6 percent of that country's national product for national defense. Certainly we are not going to get any help from the Yugoslavs.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] a few moments ago said that unless this bill is approved it will be necessary to extend the period of service for American conscripts. How many foreign countries have extended the period of service for their men? As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] very well knows that foreign countries, upon which we have lavished billions of dollars, are cutting the periods of service of their men. And Great Britain today is threatening to withdraw 1 of its 2 or 3 divisions from NATO, leaving us to hold the sack.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; if we have any genuine regard for the taxpayers of this country this bill ought to be slashed even deeper than the pending amendment proposes. Much too long have we picked the pockets of our own people while these foreign governments dragged their feet.

Our greatest security and the world's greatest security is a strong defense, coupled with the very best offensive weapons, based upon the North American Continent rather than in the hands and under the authority of unreliable allies.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] a few minutes ago. It really expressed my own sentiments. I have always supported the foreign-aid program. Every Member knows I am an internationalist. I think what we need more than anything else today is friends throughout the world. It seems to me that since this administration has been in power, however, we have been losing friends all over the world while the Soviets have been gaining them. Yet we have been spending this money. But what good has it been doing?

As I say, we must have friends throughout the world. I know we cannot buy them. But here we are spending all this money and yet we are losing many of these countries. So there is something wrong somewhere.

I supported this program mainly because it was a continuation of the Truman program. And it was effective in the Truman administration. But what is happening today? Since this administration has been in power, it seems we are dissipating all the good feeling in the world toward us. It may very well be that we ought to have this money. I may vote to restore these cuts. But I would be doing it with a good deal of trepidation, because the question in my mind is, are we doing the right thing? Where is the money going? What useful



purpose is it serving? It does not appear that we are getting too much value for our money.

I hope the Members of the House give this matter some thought, because I know that many of them feel as I do, that we have got to help our friends throughout the world. But in some cases, we seem to have spent money which, as has been pointed out by some Members, has been used against us.

Is this not a time to stop and think and reevaluate? I received a letter today from a man in my district who is 87½ years old. He pointed out to me that he has always been in favor of these foreign-aid programs. He gets \$57 a month in social security. He says, "How is it possible for me to live on that? We are spending billions of dollars all over the world. Don't we know that charity begins at home?"

I never was a believer in that philosophy. I felt that even if we had to make sacrifices at home we should help our friends abroad because in the long run that would be helping ourselves. But it is not having that effect at this time.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman realize that if he finally makes up his mind to vote to restore this cut, under the vaunted flexibility that they talk about in this program, he would be voting to make it possible for the Pentagon to give even more arms to the Arab States?

Mr. KLEIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I have a great deal of admiration for him. It was his statement here that made me revise my thinking about this, and I have not yet made up my mind.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the short time I have been here I have supported mutual security and foreign aid, but the further this debate goes the more questions I am finding in my mind. Certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] made a very excellent statement a little while ago with reference to a gentleman in Europe by the name of Tito. I am just curious to know how much of this \$600 million increase which the amendment calls for is going to that particular country. If I understand it correctly, the military aid which is being given to Yugoslavia is classified information. May I ask the chairman of the committee or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] if it is correct that the military aid to Yugoslavia is classified information?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; all military aid is classified.

Mr. SISK. Is it true that Tito is a Communist?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. SISK. Do I understand it is all right for the Communists to have information on how much American money they have, still we as Members of Congress and our people are not entitled to that information?

Mr. VORYS. I think Tito knows it, but I doubt if the rest of the Communists know it. It has been the policy not to

make those figures public for security reasons, not only as regards our enemies but also because the different countries should not be familiar with what other countries get. That has been the practice for about 9 years.

Mr. SISK. Does the gentleman mean to say that he believes that Tito will not inform Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev of the situation that exists so far as financial aid from the United States is concerned, in view of the fact that he is over there right now engaging in a love feast and is fully back in the family?

Mr. VORYS. I doubt whether Tito would tell Bulganin and Khrushchev just what he has got. I think he is still a rather independent character.

Mr. SISK. I want an answer to this question. My people must hold me responsible for spending billions of dollars all over the world, and yet you say that a Communist has a right to know what we are spending money for, but we as Members of Congress may not even know. That I cannot explain to my people.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will yield, I would agree with him that that was an accurate statement regarding funds appropriated previously. I think I might come to the same conclusion regarding information withheld on aid given in the past. But the real reason for the figures being classified for aid in the future is that there is no promise to any single country in this bill, and the administration does not want to have a figure publicized for any country, for then it can say, "The Congress has passed a bill in which it pledged us twenty, forty, or sixty million dollars." The administration properly wants always to have complete control of the program. So they bring us their estimates in confidence. They are classified information. As the thing looks on a given day, they think it would be advisable to allocate so much here and so much there. But those are never fixed figures, and the minute the estimates become public, the nations concerned tend to believe they have a right to those amounts, because they think Congress has pledged them.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Sisk was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Evidently the military and the State Department do not even trust in executive session the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. You pick up the newspaper of today and you will find that the article says, "Arms Aid to Tito Bottled Up." Evidently they did not even inform the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in executive session that they were doing it. The point is that they are finally beginning to see the mistake that we tried to have them see a year ago, and they do not have the guts to say they are bottling it up, they say, "We are not working on it any more."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for a short statement.

Mr. JUDD. Doubtless all these countries know what we have promised them in the past from previous appropriations, but not a single country has a promise of any specific amount of money, economic or military, in this bill before us.

Mr. SISK. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Pentagon and the people who are going to administer this money have no idea how much money they are going to give Yugoslavia or any other country? Are we going to be asked to give them a blank check?

Mr. JUDD. No. They presented to us their estimates. The figures in the table on pages 3 to 6 are the totals of the classified figures for the individual countries. The minute you publicize such a list, however, as the gentleman will immediately recognize, the countries affected will think they have pledges of those amounts. Suppose those in charge of the program want to cut down here or there as situations change. We do not want them frozen. Our Government needs to maintain control of the program. It must have flexibility. That is the reason the exact figures are not stated in the bill.

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. As I understand it, when this colloquy started you had in mind a question about Yugoslavia. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. That is right. I had.

Mr. DONOVAN. You might be interested in this information I picked up in a Central European country last year from the head or the near head of one of those countries. I asked him point blank, "Do you expect at any time in the near future, in view of the fact that Yugoslavia is 95 percent non-Communist, to ever see the light of day of freedom in Yugoslavia?" He stroked his chin, and he said, "Well, sir, not as long as you in the United States keep bankrolling Tito."

Mr. SISK. Of course, the point I had in mind in taking the Committee's time—because I am not an expert on foreign aid, was that I am going to be held responsible, and I think rightly so, by my constituents as to how I vote on this particular amendment, and I still do not have an answer to the question as to why we as Members of the Congress of the United States, representing 166 million people, are denied information that is given to Communist countries.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman that all of this business you have heard about Tito not telling the Kremlin what he is getting, you can put down as so much baloney, because he is not only telling him what he has got, he is telling them what he has already gotten and what he expects to get. He is saying to them, "Are you going to match it or do better?" In other words, he is using that as a lever to pry some assistance out of them. And let me say to you that Mr. Nasser in Egypt is getting wise and doing the same thing. The military came in with a figure, but they say it is classified. Once in a while they slip up and they come in with a

figure that they are going to give a couple of the Arab States that they had never given to before, and when we pinned them down they said, "That is a mistake." The reason they do that is to cover up what they are actually giving.

Mr. SISK. Would not the gentleman agree that that is a good example that we are, in essence, giving a blank check to the Pentagon without any idea of being able to justify what we are doing? Is that not one reason why we are not getting any results?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is exactly right, but if the gentleman votes for this amendment he can tell his people "I wrote them another blank check for \$600 million."

Mr. SISK. I am not going to vote for this amendment. I am going to vote against it unless someone can give me an answer to the question as to why a Communist country, a Communist leader, a man who is in Moscow embracing the head of world communism, is given information with reference to the spending of American taxpayers' dollars, information that we as Members of Congress cannot have. I think it is ridiculous, unfair, unjust, and an insult to the American people.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I am about to reveal another secret that has been classified. I find on page 15 of the committee report that they say that the request for defense support for Yugoslavia is \$30 million. Did somebody miss up on that? Did they declassify it by mistake? That is defense support.

Mr. JUDD. That is not military assistance.

Mr. MULTER. On the same page, however, they tell us the amounts for the same kind of support to our friends Greece and Turkey are also classified.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. You are going to have an opportunity, shortly I hope, to vote on aid to Yugoslavia. I am introducing that amendment right after this. If you vote to prohibit any aid to Yugoslavia, this section of the amendment will be so increased that you will not have to worry about the decreased cut.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the remarks of the lady. As I say, I have supported foreign aid before. I would like to support it now, but these are questions that I feel are important to the American people, and I know they are important to my constituents in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional minute, that I might show him the sources of the information supporting the estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Here, for instance, is the secret book that has the basic data regarding the military program for Europe, the Near East and Africa. In it are the figures and how they arrived at them, and the basis for their present estimates. Here is the one for Asia, and here the one for Europe. These contain the material on which the estimates are based.

Tito knows what he got in the past; he does not know what he is going to get, if anything, in the future, and neither does any other country.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would just like to ask the gentleman now that he has been shown these volumes if he knows any more about it than he did before?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman from Ohio knows because he has seen and studied them in committee.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, we have gone very far afield today. I would like to bring you back for a moment if I may to what we are really considering in a few minutes. We are going to vote upon the amount included in the mutual-aid bill.

Let me emphasize right here I believe if this item had been brought in for the mutual protection of the United States in a defense bill, as it might reasonably have been, there would hardly be a Member of this House dare raise his voice against it. Then the membership would realize we were jeopardizing the whole safety of our Nation.

This item is military aid that we are going to extend to people of other countries. It is to relieve us from bearing the entire burden of a future war.

Do we want to fight a future war alone? Or do we want some allies to aid us in the fight if it comes? We are going to answer this question shortly. That is exactly what we are saying through our votes.

To my Republican friends I would say this is a crucial part of the administration's program. It is the basis upon which is constructed the Eisenhower program for peace.

A few moments ago I received a letter from the President of the United States which I read for the information of the Members:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, June 7, 1956.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: No doubt you and other House leaders on both sides of the aisle realize full well, from our discussions in the White House and from my remarks yesterday to the press, the importance I attach to the pending mutual-security legislation. Nevertheless, to remove any possible doubt as to my feelings,

I am sending you this letter. You may, if you wish, bring it to the attention of the entire House membership, so strongly do I believe that the pending issue concerns the security of our country.

Great consequences are involved in this legislation. In the present international situation, the free world can ill afford to move hesitatingly and uncertainly. The United States—the most powerful of the free nations—can afford least of all to take a backward step in this constant battle all of us are waging for a just and enduring peace.

I am deeply convinced that our Nation's security and our partnership with like-minded nations in the world will be seriously impaired by the extent of the proposed cut in the funds requested this year for the mutual-security program. I, therefore, hope most earnestly that the large majority of these funds can be restored. If we fail to do so, we must either eliminate essential programs or so reduce them as to cripple our entire effort.

I know that many conscientious people are of the opinion that there will be no serious results if a severe reduction in mutual-security funds is made at this time. Yet I personally, the Secretary of State, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are united in the conviction that the proposed cut will be hurtful to the best interests of our own people and to the well-being of our friends throughout the world. I do, therefore, urge that you and your colleagues in the Congress vigorously carry forward your efforts to restore to this legislation the funds needed to maintain the pace of our battle to win a lasting peace throughout the world.

With warm regard,  
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. Chairman, all of us who attended the meeting at the White House night before last, and it included the leadership on both sides of the aisle, were deeply impressed by the statements of the President of the United States. He is a soldier, he is a man who knows the military picture thoroughly. And I believe he is one of the most sincere friends that peace has in the world today. He is fighting for peace. No one can deny that the establishment of NATO has resulted to a very large extent in peace in Europe. Some nations are free today because the armed forces of NATO have acted as a deterrent to the Communists who were looking forward to see what country they might gobble up next.

We are in a much better era. Let us keep that way. I ask you in this tense period, in this hour of uncertainty, when the whole world is a bit panicky, when no one knows what is going to happen next, Are you going to turn down the views of the President of the United States? He is the only world leader we have whether we be Democrats or Republicans. Are we going to say to him "We are denying the money you say is so necessary for the peace and security of our country?"

I do not believe you are. I just cannot believe it. I do not believe that we want to take this personal responsibility. As one individual I do not want to take that responsibility. Of course, I do not like some of these items that folks have criticized. As far as Tito is concerned, he is not for the moment affected. That battle will be fought out on another amendment to be offered later.



Is the whole security program to be wrecked by this drastic reduction? As the President himself said in the private conference the other night: Are we going to so badly jeopardize the NATO forces of Europe? Are we going to say to Russia because of a few smiles we are quitting in our defense program?

Mr. Chairman, it is just as simple as that. And let me remind you this is not an appropriation, it is an authorization bill. The situation may change from day to day. No one knows what tomorrow will bring forth. Why wreck the program now when in 2, 3 or 4 weeks another bill will come back here for consideration from the Appropriations Committee, at which time we will have a chance to review our judgment? We can have no second chance if the amendment is refused.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will vote for the Hays amendment to restore what was generally considered to be a minimum the President needs to go forward with his security commitments. This is not all he has asked, but, it is the minimum amount he says is necessary to protect the security of this country. Whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, I do not think you can take lightly the warning from the President of the United States. You are taking on a lot of responsibility if you turn down the President and the result is a deterioration of our world affairs.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the question of any Member's patriotism is involved in how he will vote upon the pending amendments or upon the bill. I think we can start with the assumption that we are all patriotic Americans and want to do the right thing for the security, safety, and the peace of our country and of the world.

I am not a confidant of the President, so I must take my information about what he says from the newspapers. Today I will take my quotations of what he says from a paper which is avowedly Republican but nevertheless fair in its reporting.

From this morning's New York Herald Tribune, I quote President Eisenhower's statement of yesterday. When his attention was directed to the situation in Yugoslavia, with reference to Tito and the Russian Communists, he said:

However, I do agree that where we stand has to be reevaluated.

This business of reevaluation has a familiar ring.

That reevaluation can take place, my friends, only by presentation of the facts. The duty to reevaluate is as much yours as his. Today, we have been urged to support the President's request. Nobody has told us why we should do it except that he asked for it. No one has yet given us the facts on which to reevaluate and to act.

I have heretofore followed the President's foreign policy requests and relied upon his statements with reference thereto. I think we must leave him now. I do so based upon his statements made at this same press conference. I refer again to the same newspaper. He says that we cannot be too particular about the special attitudes of different coun-

tries and to the way his word "neutral" is used when we refer to neutral nations, because our country, said he, had been neutral for the first 150 years of our existence. "We were neutral in the wars of the world," said he.

Well, now, if that is as little as he knows about our history it may be indicative of how little he knows about the facts on which he wants us to act. Without his telling us the facts we cannot follow. We must not follow blindly.

Turn to the same newspaper on page 25. His good friend David Lawrence writes the article "Eisenhower Is Criticized for Theory of Neutralism." You will find there a fine summary of the first 150 years of the existence of this country and the instances when we were not neutral. Of course, we were right in not being neutral. Lawrence concludes his article with the quotation of these words of President Eisenhower:

The reason we help and assist others is in the belief that this will help us, also.

Now, if we are going to give military aid, let us give it to our friends. The only reason I have been able to justify voting military aid—and this amendment before you is for military aid—the only reason I have been able to justify my voting for military aid for Yugoslavia was because we were told—and I believed it, that we were taking a calculated risk—that when the chips were down she would be on our side.

The chips are down. Where is she?

The same newspaper, headline, front page "Tito Starts Talks, Lauds Soviet Cuts in Arms." And, to quote further from the same newspaper:

They—

Meaning Tito and Bulganin and Khrushchev—

are expected to erase any rift remaining between the Yugoslav President and the Soviet leadership.

Who is our friend? Where is our friend?

Economic aid I am willing to give in the hope of winning them over. I will go along with those of you who say: "We will not call it buying friends. We just want to win them over. But military aid to our friends and only to our friends, and once they show they are not our friends, do not give them another dime, do not give them another piece of materiel, do not give them anything that may be used against us or against our friends."

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman realizes, therefore, or I gather he does from his remarks, that if this pending amendment passes, it would give the Executive and the Pentagon power to increase military aid to the Arab States and the Arab League if they choose to do so.

Mr. MULTER. That is only a small part of the problem that confronts us. I want to see peace in the Middle East, but I also want to see peace throughout the world. I am not willing to risk it in Africa, Asia, Europe, or any place else.

If this program needs reevaluation, as the President says it does, let us reevalu-

ate it. If necessary, let this Committee on Foreign Affairs, if the situation has changed since they closed these hearings, have some more hearings and get the new facts. Let us act on facts and not on mere requests.

There are political implications behind this, whether you believe it or not. The gentleman from Ohio referred to that. We, on the Democratic side, are asked to come forward and help the bipartisan policy, but the day after we do, we will have our heads handed to us, because we are Democrats.

I, for one, resent any President of our country sending a message requesting congressional action to a member of his own party rather than to the Speaker. The President, when acting officially, is President not of the Republicans but of the United States. The Speaker is not the Speaker of the Democrats but of the United States House of Representatives.

Regardless of protocol, however, I refuse to vote as requested, unless the request is backed up by sound reason fortified by solid fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. I do not intend to and I do not want any Member of this House to assume the responsibility of impeding this program. As I said yesterday, it is a good program, but it needs good administration. It demands real leadership. I say in all good faith that none of us can exercise our responsibility until the facts are submitted to us. They have not yet been submitted to us so as to warrant supporting this Presidential request.

I say, let us stay here all summer, if necessary, and get the facts and then authorize on the basis of the facts.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I believe that inherent in the Hays amendment is the fact that there will be full aid included to Tito and Yugoslavia. The gentle lady from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and I are sponsoring an amendment later to cut out United States aid to Yugoslavia. If our amendment cutting out aid to Yugoslavia is adopted, there would then be a surplus of funds which casts doubt on the necessity for the Hays amendment.

It should also be pointed out that this agency has 2½ years supply in the pipeline under this program, and there is almost \$7 billion now unspent and carried over from previous years. Congress was originally asked to add \$4.9 billion for the current year, which we will do if we vote for the full amount of the request, as provided by the Flood amendment. If the administration reevaluates this current foreign aid program and reexamines it, and then comes back here in January and asks the Committee on Foreign Affairs to reconsider this matter, I am sure that our whole committee will

give any such request every attention. We all certainly favor full support for NATO, and know the good work General Gruenther has done in building up this alliance.

Mr. MULTER. Is there any doubt that the gentleman's committee would resume hearings tomorrow if the President and the Secretary of State said that they had any new or additional facts for them?

Mr. FULTON. There is no doubt our Foreign Affairs Committee would cooperate fully. On the military-aid part of this program the last available figure from the Department of Defense is as of November 30, 1955, and the Defense Department has not been able to provide a more current regional breakdown of the pipeline figures. So nobody knows the figures exactly on this foreign aid program on which we are legislating.

Mr. MULTER. It is time we found out.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is the gentleman going to vote against this bill?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir; I am going to support this bill as I have supported every similar bill that has come before the House since I first came here in 1947. I believe in this program if properly administered.

Mr. MORANO. If this amendment is approved, will the gentleman vote for the bill?

Mr. MULTER. I will vote for the bill whether the amendment carries or is defeated. But I think the amendment is not a good one. I am referring to the Hays amendment. It is addressed solely to an increase in military aid. I say, let us have some more facts before we act on any more increases to military aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it has come to be a rather standard practice on the part of some of the Government agencies and departments to send up requests to Congress for more money than they want or expect to get. They anticipate that cuts will be made in the committee, and that when the amount requested has been cut, they will still have left all that they wanted in the first place.

Whether this bill represents such an instance or not, I think that the amount requested is far too much. I am glad that the committee cut \$1,109 million from the administration's request. But the amount carried in the bill should be reduced still further.

The Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures has reported that as of July 1 the mutual security program will have an unexpended balance of \$6.6 billion. This amount, combined with the administration's requested authorization of \$4.6 billion, would push the total up to \$11.2 billion. Mutual security expenditures for the fiscal year 1957 have been estimated at \$4.3 billion. This would increase the unexpended balance to approximately \$6.9 billion.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee is to be congratulated for the \$1.1 billion which they cut from the administration's mutual security request of \$4.6 billion.

I feel that still deeper cuts could be made, and should be made. There can no longer be any justification—moral, economic or practical—for the continuation of this worldwide free spending program which calls on the American taxpayers to support the entire world.

The inclusion of Communist Yugoslavia in this bill is a serious affront to the American people. I cannot see how, with any sense of conscience, we could possibly allocate \$30 million, plus a further sum, the amount and purpose of which is not disclosed in the bill or the committee report, to any country so closely allied with an avowed enemy. At the very time we are sitting in this Chamber, Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia is paying a state visit to Moscow. His antics and his general conduct in that capital erase any doubt that might exist as to which camp he and the Yugoslav nation belong.

On the occasion of this visit, Tito stated that never again will the Communist nations be divided. Thus, he cemented the relationship between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, binding them once again to the pursuit of their common objectives—destruction of the free-enterprise system and ultimate conquest of the world.

This unofficial alliance seems well in line with the ever-increasing cordiality and spirit of union which has existed between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union since the death of Stalin.

It seems unthinkable to me that we could seriously consider the allocation of military aid to a political system which actively plots our own destruction.

In addition to this mysterious amount which the administration would grant Communist Yugoslavia, another \$80 million has been requested for India. This is a 30 percent increase over the amount which Congress voted to give India last year. Through our foreign aid program, the American taxpayers have financed the expansion of fertilizer factories, have built schools, houses and power projects, dug irrigation wells, rehabilitated India's railroads system, and have made additional loans to the amount of \$230 million with which India could buy grain and other commodities on the world market.

During this period, India has come to adopt the attitude that the United States is obligated to send a donation each year as payment for India's not joining the Soviet bloc. The truth of the matter is that the relationship between India and the Soviet Union is such that it is difficult to say that she has not already sided with the Communists. Their pro-Communist position on practically every issue dividing the free world from the Soviet bloc is eloquent testimony to the value of the nearly \$600 million in foreign aid which we have given India since 1950.

The triumphant tour of Premier Bulganin and Party Secretary Khrushchev to India raises serious doubts as to whether or not India can still be considered a neu-

tral. The glowing tribute which Nehru paid to these two and to the Soviet system strongly suggests that India has abandoned neutrality altogether, and has become a true friend of communism.

Yesterday, the so-called neutral position taken by India in world affairs was compared to the neutrality of this country during the early days of the Republic. However, it was pointedly ignored that while India professes to be neutral she is, in effect, closely allied with Russia, and has used her middle position to play both ends, taking money from the Soviets, as well as from the United States.

The nearly \$600 million in foreign aid which we have given India since 1950 has not achieved friendship. In fact it has not even achieved cooperation.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee report, which accompanies this bill under discussion, carries on page 3 the administration's request for Egypt. As you will note, the total amount which is requested is not disclosed. We know that under title III, Technical Cooperation, the request is \$3,800,000. However, under title II, Development Assistance, the amount is held in secrecy. Congress is being called on to approve, and the American taxpayers are being called upon to finance, adventures of some nature the amount of which and the character of which is not to be disclosed to them.

This same example is repeated in nine other countries in the Middle East and Africa. I have been told that the reason for this is to prevent further inflaming the already war-sensitive atmosphere prevailing in the Middle East.

Certainly no reputable bank would lend its depositors money completely without collateral without knowing how the money was to be spent. Yet, this is precisely what the foreign-aid spenders are asking Congress to do—they would have Congress appropriate billions of dollars, a substantial part of which will finance programs which they maintain that Congress and the American people have no right to know about.

Arms shipments from Czechoslovakia to Egypt threaten to upset the balance of power and plunge that entire area into a bloody war which could easily spread to adjacent areas which are of considerable interest to the defense efforts and security of this country.

While it is true that this bill does not include any military aid to Egypt, it must be recognized that any aid will materially add to the economic strength of Egypt, thereby increasing her warmaking potential. I do not want to give the impression that I am opposed to Egypt bettering her economic position. Egypt has every right to want to improve the standard of living. However, I seriously question the wisdom of spending American dollars to strengthen any country which has, in the past several months, drifted closer each day toward the Soviet bloc.

The June 1, 1956, issue of U. S. News & World Report, under the heading "Worldgram," carries a story saying:

The efforts to make an arms deal with Red China is merely another move in the



Egyptian drift toward the Soviet bloc. Not only is Egypt placing major dependence on Soviet satellites for arms. . . . Egypt is also being rapidly integrated into the Soviet economic orbit.

This report goes on to say that Egypt has concluded trade deals with East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania, all under the domination of the Soviet Union, and that Soviet Russia's ambassador has recently made Premier Nasser a gift of a Soviet transport plane.

From any other source, these transactions could be regarded as normal. However, bitter experience has taught us that the Russians are not in the habit of giving anything without receiving heavy concessions in return.

In the hearings held by the Foreign Affairs Committee during March, April, and May of this year, it was revealed that the United States is expecting to obligate itself for \$54 million for the Aswan Dam to be constructed on the Nile River.

It is to be a tripartite project with the governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Egypt participating.

As the record of these hearings reveals, Egypt is having considerable difficulty raising her share of the total cost of the dam.

At least one member of that committee was convinced that Britain had withdrawn her support from the project. This leaves the United States squarely in the middle between two forces; one who cannot pay and one who, exercising better judgment, will not pay. What course is open to us if we should obligate ourselves for \$54 million only to learn at some later date that additional money would be needed? There is no doubt in my mind that in such an event, the free spenders in the State Department would call on Congress to approve whatever portion Britain refused to pay and whatever portion Egypt could not pay.

The completion of the Aswan Dam will bring under cultivation 1,300,000 acres. The principal export crop in Egypt today is cotton. Thus, simple logic dictates that their leading barter crop will be increased.

Cotton acreage in the United States has steadily decreased during the past 5 years as a result of overcrowded world markets. In 1951-52 cotton farmers in this country harvested 26.9 million acres of cotton. By 1954-55, this acreage had been reduced to 16.9 million acres—a reduction of 10 million acres. During this time, the cotton acreage in Egypt was increased by 264,000 acres and our surplus warehouses have steadily grown larger and larger. The 1,300,000 acres of desert land which the dam will transform into rich farmland will work toward increasing the hardships now faced by the American cotton farmer and will have a serious impact on the entire agricultural economy of this country.

Today our national debt is nearly \$278 billion. Of this amount, approximately \$55 billion has been doled out to the four corners of the earth in economic and military aid since the end of World War II.

One million dollars of this amount was used to help Denmark retire her national

debt, while our own national debt soars at dangerous heights.

Two hundred million dollars of this amount was used to finance a tax cut in England before the last general election. Yet, taxes in this country continue at nearly the confiscatory stage.

These are but a few examples of the extremes to which this foreign aid program has gone since its beginning.

The \$1.1 billion which the Foreign Affairs Committee cut from the administration's request is a positive step in the right direction. In my opinion, however, they have not gone far enough with these reductions. I believe further cuts should be made, and could be made, without jeopardizing the security of the free world. The cuts made by the Committee and any further cuts which may be made by Congress would be a great benefit to the American taxpayers. For these and other good reasons, I shall support further cuts in this bill.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, there is one question that I think needs clearing up. When the gentleman from New York was on the floor the distinguished minority leader asked him if he was willing to take the responsibility for gutting this program. Here is how the committee proposes to gut the program. Last year they got \$2,700 million. The committee this year proposes to authorize \$3,500 million, which is roughly a 30 percent increase over last year.

If that is gutting the program, then if you wanted to have your salary gutted you would get \$6,750 a year more than you do now. If that is the gentleman from Massachusetts' idea of gutting something, then I think we ought to put through a salary-gutting program right here.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Likewise, it should be pointed out that the committee figure is the exact figure that the particular bureau or agency first requested, before they increased the request a billion dollars this year.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman is correct.

The only other point I want to make is that the committee is not gutting anything. The committee is not maltreating anyone. The committee proposes to authorize 30 percent more than they said was adequate last year. If you can believe all of the optimistic statements that the press carried about how much better off we are in the world than we were a few years ago, then it looks to me as if a 30-percent increase is a pretty good proposition. You would think if we are so much better off that we ought to cut it a little. We did not do that, but we did try to get some sensible figure from the welter of confused figures that came from the Pentagon. I am sure the committee does not know exactly what the military proposes to do with the money we propose to give them.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SISK. The distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, indicated that the remarks which I and others had made about Tito and the Yugoslavia situation, did not enter into this \$600 million amendment we have before us. Will the gentleman state whether or not he feels that any portion of this \$600 million military aid might reach Yugoslavia or in any way affect that country?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, the people who came up and testified kept asking for flexibility. I think the best testimony came from the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, who said that these are only estimates; that they can do whatever they want to do with it. It is conceivable, but I think highly improbable, that if they wanted to they could give the whole \$600 million to Tito.

Mr. SISK. Is it not a fact that the \$600 million increase could certainly be of material concern so far as Yugoslavia or other European nations is concerned?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Let me answer the gentleman by saying to you that when the Under Secretary of State came up about the Aswan Dam I said, "It boils down to this. You are not here asking the committee whether we approve. You are here telling us you have already made the commitment." He said, "That is right." So, they can do anything they like.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, the President, under the language of the law now existing, can give most of whatever money is put into the bill to Yugoslavia if he wants to.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is true.

Mr. JUDD. Only if there is a later amendment which prohibits any funds going to Yugoslavia will there be any restriction on the use of funds for that purpose.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. SISK. Is it not true that if there is a later amendment which would stop aid to Yugoslavia, that that surplus might reduce any need for this \$600 million you are asking now?

Mr. JUDD. The answer to that is that this \$600 million increase will only give the minimum that the military people say they must have to operate the program with any safety. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said, they would like to have more.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. But the gentleman will admit they told us that was the minimum amount they could get along with. Now, we see the revised figure.

Mr. JUDD. I think they said that was the optimum. What we are down to now in the \$600 million figure is the minimum. If Yugoslavia were to be cut out, there would, of course, be more money for the other countries by that same amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first let me pay my respects to the President of the United States, to the Speaker, to the majority

leader and the minority leader of this House, and, most especially, the beloved southern gentleman [Mr. RICHARDS] who is chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Next, I would like to say that lest there be any misunderstanding as to why I have taken the floor, I should like to state clearly I am rising in opposition to this amendment. I shall vote against any amendment that provides an increase in this misnamed mutual security program. I shall vote for every amendment that provides a decrease. And at the end, I shall vote against the bill. I did so last year.

This is the first time I have ever engaged in general debate on this floor. I feel very deeply about that of which I am talking. I come from a rural region, but the people there are good people, and they are right thinking.

Let me tell you, they have been thinking very very seriously about what the Congress of the United States has been doing to pull down and destroy this country from within.

I am not afraid of Russia and her might; I am not afraid of Yugoslavia; I am not afraid of India; I am not afraid of any enemy outside the borders of this country. I am afraid of what we will do to ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, this country will never be destroyed unless socialism first takes hold of this country. That is the pattern; that is what has happened in so many countries, and that is what communism is aiming to do to our United States. We are the only stronghold left that will keep communism from enslaving the world. Enemies from within are working day and night to accomplish this purpose.

When the war was over my heart was deeply touched. I would have done anything on earth to restore the ruins left in war's wake in so many countries. To help those people recover from their wounds was a good thing to do, and a thing that the American people cooperated in heartily.

To the Foreign Affairs Committee whose members have traveled so much all over the world, let me say I have not seen the world. I do not know what it looks like, but I can read and I can study; and I know that this program has come to be wrong.

This Congress is going to be turned upside down and every person who votes for this program that is presented here is going to have to face the people of his district when he goes home. The most refreshing thing that has happened to me since I have been privileged to sit with you here is the debate that has gone on today.

Why are you men and women rising to speak? Why are you questioning? Because your people back home are letting you know that they are distressed about this program.

Why was it last year that we could not reduce the income tax of the lower middle-class people of this country to the tune of even \$100? Are we trying to destroy them with wastage and throwing away the great inheritance that we have; that came to us by blood, sweat, and tears through the years?

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your listening to me. I do not have anything more to say except that if this House has not felt the deep stirrings in the hearts of the American people all over this country you will feel them soon, because, God helping me, I can stand here and testify that the spirit of independence, the goodness and the commonsense of the ordinary American citizen is not dead. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, if this were a popularity contest and by my vote or my action I could show my deep affection for the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] I would be the first man in line, because ever since he has been a Member of the House I have valued him as one of my closest and dearest friends and I know he has regarded me likewise.

This is not an issue of personalities. This is an issue of judgment. It is an issue of what is best not for the countries throughout the world but for the national security of the United States of America. To me that is the issue. I challenge the judgment, not the patriotism, not the friendliness, of those members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who have brought this bill here. I know they love their country just as well as I do. I know they are just as patriotic citizens as I hope to be.

Let me go back just a little. I stood in this well as majority leader in 1938, 1939, and 1940 and pleaded with the Congress to follow the recommendations of the then President of the United States in voting some money to make our country stronger. Most of that money was denied because the people said "Where is there any danger? Who is going to fight us? We have no enemies in the world." And, as our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], said this morning, a few weeks before Pearl Harbor the House of Representatives by one vote extended the National Draft Act. If by that one single vote we had not extended that act, when we were struck at Pearl Harbor, we would have been breaking our Army down instead of keeping it together. The Japanese knew that we were weak on land and on sea, and that is the reason why they struck us at Pearl Harbor. And, if they had had a little more force, they would have landed at some points in the United States of America.

I am convinced, as the President of the United States is, as the Secretary of State is, as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is, that it is necessary for the security of this country of ours to vote more money than the committee brought in. If I did not believe that, if I believed that this could be cut one dollar and not hurt my country, its status, its leadership, and its power in the world, I would vote to reduce even the amount that this committee brought forth. We just have one President of the United States at a time. He is the voice of America, or America has no voice. And, I have said that for 30 years in this House, it mattered not who was President of the United States. Tremendous and crushing responsibilities rest upon

the shoulders of the Commander in Chief of our Army and our Navy. He should know more about it than I do, even though he were not a military man, because he has avenues of learning more about it than I know from the people who surround him.

I think we should make this additional appropriation. I am afraid not to do it, because I do not want to see the flash of guns and hear the hum of planes, with their destruction, over my country, when I think that with a few more million dollars I could deter the aggressor. We were not prepared in 1939, 1940, and 1941. Talk about \$50 billion. If it had not been for the Marshall plan and point 4, Western Europe would today be in the bosom of communism and behind the Iron Curtain. We spent those billions. I think it was the best defense money that I ever voted. But, we were not prepared. We were forced into a war, and it cost us more than \$400 billion to get out of it and on to victory. And, with that, we had more than a million casualties; 293,000 dead, 144,000 missing, probably dead, and the remainder maimed and crippled. If this \$600 million will deter our enemies, then it will be the best investment that you and I have ever voted since we have been Members of this House.

So today, as I have said to you so often, as an old friend who has been in this House now nearly 44 years, through 2 wars and some depressions, in my opinion this \$600 million additional is the best defense money that I ever voted for and the best defense money that the Congress ever gave.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the generosity of the great Speaker of this House who has just addressed you. I admit his utter sincerity in the words he has spoken. I have great admiration and affection for him.

I feel no pleasure in crossing swords with a great man like SAM RAYBURN, if I may take the liberty of referring to him so intimately in my last weeks in this House. The same sentiments apply to JOE MARTIN. They are two great Americans. I have often thought that either of these men would make a great President of our country. That also applies to JOHN McCORMACK, the majority leader, and the gentleman from Indiana, CHARLIE HALLECK, who has been majority leader when the Republicans controlled the House. It is no pleasure to me to take issue with them, and I would be the last man in this House to criticize them or to impugn their motives. But I cannot help but say that I am deeply distressed and disturbed at the attitude they are taking here today.

Here they are, the former Speaker of the House and the present Speaker of the House, who have said time after time how they loved this House and how they



would fight to preserve the integrity of this House, leading this fight to repudiate what a committee, an arm of this House, has done.

Much has been said of the checks and balances provided between the executive, the judiciary, and the legislative by the Founding Fathers. We all agree that those checks and balances guaranteed us by the Constitution are the bulwark of our liberty, yet these distinguished gentlemen want to disrupt and destroy 2 months of committee work upon an executive request, and are themselves helping to destroy one of the checks essential to the preservation of democratic government, and they are doing it in their own house.

I have great respect for the President of the United States. I go beyond that to say I have affection and admiration for him. I had the same respect for President Truman, but I did not agree with him all the time and fought dictation by him to the legislative branch.

Here we find the executive department of the Government, which can only propose to the Congress of the United States, attempting to dictate to the Congress, and the position is taken by our leaders that we dare not differ with the dollar figures sent here. How many authorizing committees give the executive department everything it asks? Do you want to destroy constitutional government and not let the Congress of the United States scan, even, the figures that the executive department sends up here?

It would be a different matter if I were seeking to destroy this bill or to destroy this country. There is not one single Member of this House who can say that I ever let partisanship enter into any position I have taken in regard to a foreign aid bill, whether a Democratic administration was in power or the Republican administration. If there is such a man or woman, I wish he would rise now. The stakes were too great for anything as cheap as that.

I took the same attitude when I felt that a Democratic President was wrong, because I felt that a proper function of a committee of the House of Representatives and the Members of the House was to scan those executive dollar requests and authorize only those that could be justified. If we do not have that check, if we do not have that balance, then we had just as well not sit here.

Why did the Constitution of the United States place the responsibility of initiating appropriations of funds in the House of Representatives? Because we come directly from the people, directly from the people every 2 years. That is a great responsibility. But this is not an appropriation bill, this is an authorization bill. Our leaders here today say that the authorizing committee of the House of Representatives, in this instance the Foreign Affairs Committee, should abdicate its thinking, should abdicate its power, and they say, "Let the men of good sense, who have some brains, on the Appropriations Committee, work their will on it." The distinguished minority leader and my distinguished friend from Ohio talk about that

kind of stuff, "leave it to the Appropriations Committee." What a cowardly thing to propose.

Mr. Chairman, we have come here with what we think is a good bill for the security of the United States. We think our committee has provided plenty of money to do it, \$860 million more than was provided last year, to do the job that should be done. I want to tell you solemnly that it is my honest conviction that the money provided here is amply sufficient to continue a proper contribution in the field of foreign aid. Our funds are not inexhaustible.

Sure, you have got to have stuff in the pipelines. We have \$5 billion of military aid now in the pipelines. The flexibility provided in this bill can keep the pipelines flowing. Here you find the greatest flexibility power ever given to any President of the United States. He can move funds all over the place, from one side of the world to the other, to meet any emergency. Any President has to have flexibility, and I have fought for that, because he is the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. If you are going to have this kind of program you have to have all kinds of flexibility. But please do not stand here, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Former Speaker of the House of Representatives, and tell members of the committee who have fought for this program since 1948 that we do not have a right, after all those years of experience and 2 months of hearings on this particular bill, to say to the executive department, "Now, Mr. President, we want to go along with you but we represent our people, too. After careful study, we think you ask too much."

The Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, and the former minority leader are great men. They have great intelligence. But they did not sit up there with the committee for 8 long weeks. They know little about the details of this bill, I will tell you that. All they know is that the President called us down to the White House and the military boys sat there and said, "We need more money." The President said, "We need more money." But not one single new reason, new emergency, new figure, new study upon which to base their request. They just wanted more money.

I have great admiration for our military people. I say again that I have great admiration for the President of the United States. But I also have a sense of responsibility as a member of a responsible committee of this House. Instead of building up the prestige of this House and its committees today, I feel that our leaders are contributing to the tearing down of that prestige because they are surrendering to the executive department. In this I hope the membership here will not follow them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full time, but I want to support the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I understood there was a unanimous-consent agreement that debate on this section be closed after the three speeches by Speaker RAYBURN, Minority Leader MARTIN, and the chairman of the committee, Mr. RICHARDS. Is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not correct. The request was made and it was objected to. It was not agreed to by the House.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] the debate close on this section, and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, as \$1 billion of this cut in foreign aid was my amendment, I feel I should likewise stand up and say the reason, under these difficult circumstances. I am glad to stand firmly for what I believe to be the right stand of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and am glad to support fully the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], in his courageous action.

The reason is that we members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs feel that the United States foreign-aid program should be efficiently run at present, and should have a thorough reexamination between now and January of next year, as the administration has suggested.

With 2½ years of products and munitions in the pipelines, this current reduction will not endanger this program, because the time is so far ahead that we can still have time to come up with more funds in January and February, in case of necessity, after the reserve demanded by changing world conditions has been made in our United States foreign policy.

In the Legislative Daily of Tuesday, May 22, here is what is said about the United States foreign-aid program:

Comptroller General Campbell told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over-optimistic foreign-aid planning has resulted in appropriation of more money than could be spent.

One result, he said, is that the Defense Department is holding at least \$400 million in foreign-aid funds in violation of the law. That money, Campbell said, should revert to the Treasury.

Two main factors, Campbell said, contribute to overprogramming foreign aid. He said the International Cooperation Administration "apparently does not consider realistically the available resources and capabilities of both the United States and individual recipient countries." He also said "there is sometimes a preponderance of political over economic and financial considerations in determining the level of country programs."

This statement should certainly be a watch signal to Congress if such conditions exist extensively.

In conclusion, may I say that the House Foreign Affairs Committee after 6 weeks' work on this bill has reported what it feels is a good recommendation to this House by a vote of 18 to 11. This is what we feel is best for the security of the United States, and I sincerely hope the House will sustain the Foreign Affairs Committee and our chairman [Mr. RICHARDS].

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement, all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, is now closed.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hays].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDS. As I understand it, that amendment is to put the figure back to the original executive request. Is that right?

The CHAIRMAN. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, that is what it does.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood to the amendment offered by Mr. Hays of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, after "exceed" strike out "\$1,925,000,000" and insert "\$2,925,000,000"; and on page 2, line 4, strike out "\$402,000,000" and insert "\$599,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the substitute amendment. Without objection the Clerk will again read the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Bentley].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bentley as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Hays of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, strike out "\$1,925,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,425,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bentley) there were—ayes 69, noes 178.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hays].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. HAYS of Arkansas.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 192.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Title I, chapter 3, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to defense support, is further amended by substituting a semicolon for the period after "Asia" in subsection (c) of section 131 and inserting thereafter the following: "and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed—

- "(1) \$63,700,000 for Europe (excluding Greece and Turkey);
- "(2) \$170,000,000 for the Near East (including Greece and Turkey) and Africa;
- "(3) \$882,000,000 for Asia; and
- "(4) \$32,000,000 for Latin America.

"Funds made available under paragraph (4) may be used to furnish assistance designed to sustain and increase military or internal defense efforts, and may be used without regard to the requirements of sections 141 and 142 in the case of any nation which is a party to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and which has adhered to the resolution of 1954 entitled 'Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States against the Intervention of International Communism.'"

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dodd: On page 2, line 19, strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert "\$37,000,000."

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, in my remarks during general debate yesterday, I said that I would offer an amendment to increase defense support assistance to Guatemala.

The amendment which I have offered increases the amount of money for Guatemala by \$5 million.

It seems strange to me that this administration is willing to pour millions of dollars of foreign aid into doubtful areas of the world such as Yugoslavia, but is penurious and miserly about the amount of assistance for a friendly, neighboring western hemispheric country like Guatemala.

Frankly, this is an enigma of our present foreign policy. When the expert witnesses appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee and were asked why they had not recommended at least as much money as was assigned last year, they made a feeble answer to the effect that Guatemala could not absorb such an amount of money. This, I say, is nonsense and the record for last year proves that it is nonsense.

The amount of money allotted to Guatemala last year was less than 3 percent of the gross national income of that country, and I think it is important to point out that most of it last year was, and this year will be, spent right here in the United States for equipment, machinery, and materials.

Is it not shortsighted for us to even propose assistance to Yugoslavia, especially now, and to cut down our assistance to Guatemala, to the only country in history that has been able to overthrow its Communist masters—a country that has come back from the dead and is now forging the sinews of a stable and solid economy?

If Guatemala, the anti-Communist showcase of the western free world, should lose its confidence in our friendship and become disillusioned, it will crack. And when Guatemala cracks, all of Central America is ripe for the Communists. And that means the Panama Canal, too.

I have confidence that Guatemala will use our assistance wisely.

The liberation government of Col. Castillo Armas has been in power only since July 1954. What did it find when it came into power? Two million dollars in the Treasury, barely enough for 2 weeks' expenses, administrative chaos, unrest, financial demoralization, a tottering economy—all left behind by the

Communist-dominated Arbenz regime. It takes time for a government to recover from chaos. The Guatemalan Government has done a miraculous job.

Last year Guatemala got \$15 million in development assistance from the United States. This year the amount recommended falls far short of that amount. And this is the critical year. My amendment still will not bring the amount for Guatemala up to last year's amount. But I feel that some demonstration on the part of the Congress—even the amount contained in this amendment, small as it may be, is essential to give the Guatemalan Government renewed courage. In fact, such action will give courage to all our friends in Latin America at a time when friends are scarce and neutralists abound. Surely this is an amendment which we cannot afford to bypass.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. While we cannot talk about what this money will do, we can say with assurance that this money will be used to help in the hemispheric defense. Is that not so?

Mr. DODD. Yes; of course that is so.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I heartily join with the gentleman and with his amendment, because there is no doubt that the Communists when they left Guatemala left the country almost bankrupt.

Mr. DODD. Yes; that is right.

One of the best surveys I have seen on inter-American affairs is contained in a report to the President by his brother, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, entitled "United States-Latin American Relations," and I want to quote what I consider to be a very significant statement from that report. Dr. Eisenhower, in discussing the political aspect of our relationship with Latin America, stated:

The possible conquest of a Latin American nation today would not be, so far as anyone can foresee, by direct assault. It would come, rather, through the insidious process of infiltration, conspiracy, spreading of lies, and the undermining of free institutions, one by one. Highly disciplined groups of Communists are busy, night and day, illegally or openly, in the American Republics, as they are in every nation of the world.

This is even more true today.

This is a small amount contained in my amendment but its significance is as important as anything we do here today.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I want to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful to my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee of the Whole approve this amendment, and I hope that it does.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the item provided for Guatemala was \$27 million in the execu-



tive request. This committee added \$5 million to it on account of the particular situation in Guatemala.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The item listed for Guatemala is not \$27 million. That is for all Latin America. This is just \$5 million for Guatemala.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. I misstated it. The addition was \$5 million, and it was to apply to Guatemala.

This is 1 of the 2 instances in the bill where the committee raised the executive request. The other was \$1 million in another instance.

I just do not want to add any more to this. If the House wants to vote it, all right, and I have the highest respect for the gentleman who offered the amendment, but I do not think we should add an additional \$5 million for Guatemala.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of our distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. Dobb] to increase aid to Guatemala. Yesterday on the floor, I stated my disappointment of the fact that the State Department considered shabbily, in my opinion, the cause of Guatemala and the free world and those who are willing to make a strong fight against Communist aggression and in the cause of human freedom and liberty. But at the same time, the Departments of State and Defense recommended about \$50 million for economic and military aid to the Communist dictator Tito of Yugoslavia, whose record is one of opposing the forces of freedom such as in the fight against Communist aggression in Korea in 1950. Within the past several days Tito renewed his allegiance to the cause of communism throughout the world in the course of his pilgrimage to Moscow.

In my opinion, we as Members of Congress who have taken our oath to protect the security and welfare of the United States, will become a laughing stock of the free world, as well as the Communist world, if we support the Russian Communist stooge Tito on the one hand and on the other hand fail to give necessary economic aid to our sister Republic of Guatemala in the Western Hemisphere. Guatemala is the only free republic in the evil history of world communism, which has suffered under the tyranny, exploitation, and degradation of communism, and which has overthrown the despotic rule of communism. This is a classic symbol for freedom in this hemisphere and throughout the world. Guatemala is a focal point, as was expressed by a Communist leader in New York in April, in which he expressed the Marxist hope that Guatemala was only a temporary setback and that communism again would prevail in Guatemala. If we are sincere in our desire to stem the tidal wave of communism throughout the world, there is no better opportunity than is presented to us today to give adequate economic aid to the great and free country of

Guatemala which has stood up against communism, which has overthrown communism, and which is working for the cause of human freedom and liberty in Guatemala, which of course, will inure to the cause of human freedom and liberty throughout the world.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise briefly at this time to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dobb] and cosponsored by our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I just want to make it clear that I offered an amendment to the committee to increase it by 10 million and it was cut to 5 million; but the vote to increase it this extra 5 million in committee was just 1 vote different. We lost it by one vote. So I am in favor of this amendment.

Mr. HILLINGS. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. I intended to comment on the fact that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO] has long been interested in the problems of Guatemala and the Latin American field and has had much to do with the assistance rendered to that area by the Congress of the United States.

There has been much criticism of the bill before us on the ground that we ought to first consider our own backyard before thinking about spending money in vast fields abroad. Certainly anyone who takes such a position must support this particular amendment, because here is a case where a little country in America's own backyard has thrown off the yoke of communism.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to second the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Connecticut, and I urge, with all of the strength that I can command, that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this amendment. I believe we should do so not only because of the great contribution that the present leaders of Guatemala have already made to the cause of freedom, but also because of the immensely valuable contributions they intend to make in the future. I also congratulate my colleagues from Connecticut, Mr. Dobb and Mr. MORANO, for their interest in this amendment.

As many Members will recall, I had the occasion to visit Guatemala for on-the-spot studies both before and after the revolution that upset the Communist regime, when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America, of the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression. And when I say "Communist regime," I mean just that. There was absolutely no question in my mind, or in the minds of our committee, but that the former Government of Guatemala was completely, and openly loyal to Moscow. And I believe that the report we submitted to this House contained irrefutable evidence that the Kremlin was using Guatemala as a bridgehead in its program to expand, and to subvert all of Central America, the Caribbean, and northern South America, as well as the Republic of Panama. Communists carrying official

Guatemalan passports, literally swarmed into the countries of that whole area, carrying instructions and advice from the Red high command to local Communist leaders; transporting tons of propaganda books, leaflets, and newspapers; and agitating among the workers and intellectuals in a systematic program to stir up discontent against established governments.

I think we can give some attention to the present residence of the former Communist President of Guatemala, in Prague, Czechoslovakia, where he recently was interviewed by a group of Latin American newspapermen, and flatly stated that he would return to Guatemala in the near future. I believe we should weigh the importance of his two reported, lengthy visits to Moscow, and the reports that he is being prepared for an important new role in the Communist program for Latin America. We should also take note of the fact that another former Guatemalan Communist president, Juan Jose Arevalo, the man who actually betrayed his nation into Communism, was recently named 1 of the 3-man board to head the Communist labor movement of all Latin America. And this labor movement is probably the most powerful single tool that the Communists possess in their plan to subvert the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, when the present leaders of Guatemala overthrew that Communist government, they rendered a mighty service to every nation in the Western Hemisphere, including the United States.

Now they propose to join with us in an active program to combat the Communist campaign in the Western Hemisphere, and all of the underdeveloped areas. Many of you will recall that this desire was clearly expressed by the President of Guatemala, when he testified before the subcommittee, shortly after the revolution.

I am convinced that this country can, and will, render continuing and valuable services to the cause of peace, freedom, and security in the Western Hemisphere.

But certainly, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, Guatemala cannot make its contribution until it is internally strong, politically, socially, and especially economically. Because of the coffee depression that occurred right after the revolution, and the bankrupt government and excessive debt inherited by the new administration, they need a modest amount of assistance from us. At the request of the United States Embassy and ICA mission in Guatemala, the Government prepared an estimate of the aid they would require. After ruthlessly slashing the estimates of the various experts, the Guatemalan Cabinet came up with the figure of about \$17 million.

I strongly believe we should make this amount available with the greatest of good will. After all, this is one of the few allies which is anxious to help us, in our critical and costly ideological struggle against Communist imperialism.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Has the gentleman encountered resistance somewhere in any

part of the Government to increased assistance to Guatemala?

Mr. HILLINGS. I could not say that I have encountered actual resistance on the part of officials, but it seems that when it comes to dealing with these problems some things do not move as fast as we would like them to or as we think they should.

Mr. JUDD. Has the gentleman found resistance from some of the commercial interests?

Mr. HILLINGS. No; I know of no such resistance at the present time.

Mr. JUDD. I have had some things brought to my attention that made me a little suspicious in both cases, and I feel the Congress ought to pass this and serve notice that we are going to stand by these peoples who have thrown out the Communists and support our way of life.

Mr. HILLINGS. I think we should express ourselves positively in support of these Latin American countries, especially Guatemala, and in an effective way. I hope this amendment will pass.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. I wish to commend my colleague from California on the speech he is making and to associate myself with his words. When such countries throw off Communist domination certainly it behooves us if it is possible to support them and thus give proof of our approval. This also would be an example to other nations and lead them to throw off communism.

Mr. HILLINGS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment which has been submitted by my distinguished friend from Connecticut, a member of the subcommittee dealing with this little country of Guatemala.

Speaking of little countries, I think it is a rather sad thing that in the committee report such great care was taken to exclude the possibility, at least in the report, of any aid to another little country only 8 years old.

If, Mr. Chairman, as the greatest free nation in the world we cannot help other free nations then I know not where we are going. Guatemala is now a free nation. It needs our help, it deserves our help.

The tiny State of Israel is a free nation. It needs our help. It does not need this Congress to specifically exclude it from the report.

I am somewhat amazed by the pious proclamations from the left side of the aisle on the progress being made in the affairs of the world. I am somewhat amazed that our President only a week ago stood up before a large group and said in effect, everything is peachy in world affairs, but do not be complacent about the election.

Everything is not peachy; everything is not peachy in the Middle East, it is oily.

Our policy in the Middle East seems to be revolving around oil rather than democracy and human rights. Our policies in the Middle East are not firm. We have not made commitments to which

the little nation of Israel is entitled. She is only 8 years old and she still needs our help desperately. She does not need platitudes, she needs help.

We are a party to the tripartite agreement of 1950. We have heard very little about that. Consider the disintegration of the status of our neighbor and friend England throughout the world, the difficulties of our neighbor and friend France, another guarantor in the tripartite agreement. Look at the situation today, and I ask you, while you are voting for funds to help nations of dubious international stature, how in the name of the Lord we can specifically exclude a nation that is founded on right, that is founded on the blood and sweat of a courageous people who for 2,000 years were oppressed and finally got their place in the sun.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather comforting and revealing to hear the words of the gentleman from New Jersey who has just spoken on the need for shipment of arms to the infant State of Israel. I want to remind the Members that on February 26 of this year, 151 Congressmen, Members of the House, more than one-third of the membership of the House, asked for prompt and decisive measures by our Government toward the security guarantees on the sale of defensive arms to Israel. There were 50 Republicans and 101 Democrats who signed that manifesto asking for arms for Israel so that there could be something in the nature of a balance. Republicans urged that the administration take "positive steps toward the protection of free nations such as Israel and toward the dissolution of dangers which, in threatening the peace of Israel, threaten also the peace of the free world." The Democrats likewise urged "that our Government permit Israel to purchase the \$50 million of defensive arms which she seeks in the country."

Presently there is a very decided imbalance of arms as between Israel and the Arab States.

These Arab States have refused to enter into any manner or kind of peace negotiations with Israel. They refuse to recognize the State of Israel. They want Israel destroyed and blotted out. Israel to them is expendable. Nasser, the present, shall I say, Pharaoh of Egypt, has had the temerity to state that Israel is like a condemned prisoner in the dock awaiting execution.

King Saud of Saudi Arabia—January 1954—stated:

Israel is like a cancer to the human body, and the only way of remedy is to uproot it.

Dr. Mohammad Fadhi Jamali, former Prime Minister of Iraq—April 1955—stated:

We sincerely hope that \* \* \* all fair-minded peoples in the world will continue to brand Israel as an illegitimate state.

An editorial in Al Gomhouria, Egyptian Government-controlled newspaper—April 11, 1956—stated:

The only reasonable proposal which Mr. Hammarskjöld can make is the obliteration of Israel from the face of the earth.

We hear much about what the Secretary of the United Nations Hammarskjöld has recently accomplished by way of a cease-fire order as between Israel and her hostile neighbors. We must remember that basic questions were not resolved. There was a cease-fire order in 1948.

Israel wants more than a cease fire. She wants peace, a lasting peace, with her neighbors. But, if there is a continuance of shipment of arms, particularly from Red sources, to Egypt, there will be no peace. We know that Red arms have rolled into Egypt from Czechoslovakia, and unfortunately we have rolled tanks into Saudi Arabia ourselves. And Red arms are going likewise into Syria, and we have sent arms to Iraq. Both Iraq and Saudi Arabia are members of the so-called Arab League which is bent upon the destruction of Israel. It does not make sense that we, who want to have peace or supposedly want peace with Israel, should at the same time feed into the Arab maw additional arms, arms of destruction, arms that would destroy Israel. And I can assure you that while there may be a temporary truce, Nasser is just awaiting the time when his soldiery will be able to use the Russian MIGs and the British Centurion tanks to march onto Israel.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman agree to an amendment to section 3, beginning on line 4, page 3, providing language like this: Provided, however, that none of the funds appropriated in this section shall be used in any of the countries that are members of the Arab League except those members of the Baghdad Pact, until they sit down at a peace conference with Israel.

Mr. CELLER. Well, that is a very difficult question to answer. I still have some degree of confidence in the administration which I am now criticizing, and I hope that some semblance of sense will dawn upon Secretary of State Dulles with reference to the Middle East. I am somewhat loathe to give an affirmative reply to the gentleman, and it might be well not to stir up the waters at this time in the way that the gentleman seeks by offering his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I hope that we will be able to persuade the administration to do the needful in that regard and that it would not be necessary to admonish them, shall I say, by an amendment to this act.

Mr. DONOVAN. I want the gentleman to understand that I do not propose that, but I wanted to know if the gentleman would support such an amendment. I know I would if the gentleman would.



Mr. CELLER. In the light of my explanation, the answer would be rather embarrassing, and I hope that such an amendment will not be pressed. This is not the best road toward peace for all peoples. It is hoped also that we will be able to prevail upon the administration to finally send arms into Israel, because there is only one way to preserve peace in the Middle East, and that is to have a balance of arms. The only reason why we have no holocaust of a third war between the East and the West is because there is something in the nature of a balance of arms. The same thing holds true as between Egypt and little Israel. Let there be a balance of arms there, and there will be no danger. It is rather anomalous that the administration says it does not wish to enter into an arms race, yet the administration hides behind our allies' skirts, which is in the nature of hypocrisy, and says to France "You ship your jets" and says to the members of the NATO alliance "You ship, to Egypt, but we shall not ship directly." It does not make sense, and I still hope therefore that the White House and the Secretary will do the needful. It is true that doubt grows when we see the acceptance by the administration of the latest U. N. resolution on the Middle East.

The Arab States, abetted by Russia, forced the Eisenhower administration to delete the paragraph expressing the need to create conditions in which a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis can be arranged. This was a further appeasement of the Arabs. The administration seems satisfied with a shortsighted policy of a mere cease fire in the Middle East. The words deleted might have been a basis for a permanent peaceful settlement. Our delegates at the U. N. found themselves in strange company. Soviet Russia likewise wants no peace. She too wants a temporary truce. In the meantime our arms roll into Iraq and Saudi Arabia and Red arms pour into Egypt and Syria. The arms imbalance between Israel and the Arab States is thus widened.

What explanation can Mr. Dulles give concerning Colonel Nasser's latest deal with Red China? Nasser will soon visit Chou En-lai. The Egyptian Army accepts an invitation to send a military mission to Peiping. A Red China trade commission is presently arranging a barter of cotton for arms. Cairo newspapers boast of Nasser's master stroke in circumventing the western idiots.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dobb]. It is my very sincere hope that the arguments that have been advanced with respect to the necessity for this additional and relatively small amount to the Republic of Guatemala will receive the approval of the House, and thus the pending amendment will be passed. We should bear in mind that Guatemala represents the one nation in the world today which, having come under the domination of international communism, successfully threw off the yoke and re-

turned to the ways of freedom and of democratic processes.

Guatemala needs the small amount that is here suggested. In many quarters it has been charged that having assisted Guatemala to resist the aggression, we turned our national back on them and with the successful termination of hostilities our interest in the welfare of the people of that country lapsed. Certainly I do know—and I might say parenthetically that I know that small and beautiful republic and its people well—that the people of Guatemala are an industrious and friendly people. They are determined and courageous, and I believe them to be a people who will use this additional amount of money wisely and well if provided by the Congress.

The economy of Guatemala during the period of the Communist regime there was good, largely because of the price of coffee. Unfortunately, since that time the basic single-crop economy has suffered to a substantial degree by reason of a depression in the world market price of coffee. I am confident that Guatemala will make progress under the administration of President Armas. I am certain that it will in due course become a leader in the Latin American world. The eyes of all the republics of Latin America are today on the Republic of Guatemala as they are also upon the United States. What happens in Guatemala will in large part condition the thinking of millions of Latin Americans in all of the republics to the south of us.

It seems to me that in our own national self-interest as well as in the interest of the inhabitants of Guatemala, who are in large part anti-Communist, that we will act favorably on the pending amendment. It is to be hoped that the House will undertake to consider favorably the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dobb].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made and also to thank him for the support he gave me when I offered an amendment in committee which, with his help, carried, to aid Guatemala to the extent of \$5 million additional.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to assist the gentleman in committee, and as those of you who heard me previously speak this morning know, I have not attempted to increase any other item since.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from California and also with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dobb] in favor of the amendment. I have had the privilege of visiting Guatemala. I know something of the conditions there left by the Communists when they were kicked out.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the arguments that the gentleman from California has made and that the author of the amendment has made are so convincing that the amendment ought to pass unanimously. I have made several visits to Guatemala and I hope that little country will survive and become a good, strong, free country again.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. Let me say this, that we have in Guatemala a substantial ally in the Western Hemisphere. We have an ally which has proven itself, which has given a demonstration of the dedication of its substantial leadership to the principles of human freedom. Certainly the amount that is here requested is not great as we consider sums today, in relation to other provisions of this bill. I sincerely urge a vote in support of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my colleague from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, from the arguments I have heard concerning the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dobb], I believe that the amendment should be approved unanimously. How can we fail to support the heroic efforts of Guatemala to stamp out Communist aggression. I have been in Guatemala several times. I was there when we had an Air Force station there and we were fearful of what might happen to the Panama Canal Zone. The City of Guatemala was a beautiful city but the rural areas were very primitive and undeveloped. It seems incredible that the Communists would go over halfway around the world to blot out a small country simply to destroy its effort to build a democratic and free country. But we must not forget that this effort on the part of the Communists is primarily aimed at us, as the destruction of the free world is their ultimate aim and the United States is the leader of the free world today.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, Hon. THOMAS J. DOBB, which would increase the military assistance to Latin America from \$32 million to \$37 million specifically allocated \$5 million more to the Republic of Guatemala.

Recent events dealing with the infiltration of the Communists in the Government of Guatemala are well known. It is extremely significant that the first foothold of the Communists in the Western Hemisphere has been repudiated and the Government of Guatemala is now once again among the freedom loving Republics of the world.

I support this amendment not only for the specific reasons which have been enumerated by prior speakers in whose remarks I wholeheartedly concur, but also because of basic principles which

are common knowledge and readily understood and agreed to by all of us.

The solidarity of North and South America is a bulwark of the free world in today's gigantic struggle for freedom. It is of necessity the most important thing related to the freedom of the United States of America.

The spirit of independence which rises from the valleys of the Mississippi and Missouri to the heights of the Rockies rises with equal vigor and intensity from the valleys of the Orinoco and the Amazon to the heights of the Andes. This spirit flows and is joined across the Isthmus of Central America, of which Guatemala is a part.

Therefore, it behooves us to do everything within our power to recognize in every way the fierce spirit of independence and freedom in both North and South America, to nurture it, cultivate it, and assist it in every way.

The Republic of Guatemala which has overthrown the shackles of Communist infiltration would be tremendously assisted not only by the additional finances which this amendment would make available, but also by the recognition we give to the fighting spirit and the desire of a great Latin American people to be free in their own right.

I trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and rise in support of the amendment.

It is with considerable pride and enthusiasm that I rise in support of the Dodd amendment providing an additional \$5 million assistance to Guatemala.

The pages of history point to Guatemala as a significant example of our inclination to dally with our commitments. This courageous little Republic cast off her communistic yoke of oppression just 1½ years ago. The Communists left this little country's treasury stripped, depleted and empty. Guatemala, which has won the universal acclaim of the world for its mighty titanic struggle for peace and freedom needs prompt and effective help. The assistance given has been slow and highly inadequate. The whole world has been watching her plight and this—our own hemisphere—is particularly alive to the exigencies of the situation. The hour is late, but not too late to remedy it.

I have no misgivings in pointing up the poverty and the loneliness and the frustrations of little nations and little peoples wherever they may be on the face of the earth. I do this in the sense of causing no diminishment to their sovereignty or national pride. It is in seeing a problem that we best can effect a solution. If we are going to render assistance, we must of course appreciate the area that is in need of help.

On the entire national scene, we see today a tournament of hate being engendered by the East versus the West. It might be fitting to pause and see who, actually, among the nations of the world we can count on as being friendly.

It is said that a man is lucky if he ends up with just one friend in a lifetime. I

say that in the lifetime of nations, maybe that nation is likewise fortunate if it ends up with just one friend. But it would be to bad if we should limit our whole and total national activities in the acquisition of friends and allies to merely 1, 2, or a dozen or the total of seventy-odd nations that compose the family of countries.

So I am happy to reassert my affection for all of the countries of the Americas. But while we are helping the countries of America, let us not forget the little country of Israel, who today stands as a beacon of friendship and of freedom. Israel has become one of the champions in the fight against international communism. With the entire Middle East succumbing to the threats and blandishments of the Communists we find Israel standing fast behind the same principles of human freedom and dignity on which our own Nation was founded. Today the State of Israel stands alone in Asia and the Middle East as a beacon for democracy, an island surrounded by forces which threaten its life and very existence, forces who see in Israel a threat and living refutation of the systems of despotism and absolutism whether same be the leftism of communism or the rightism of feudalism or colonialism to which most of the surrounding nations are clearly wedded and devoted. Let us ever be mindful of the fact that she is hemmed in by forces who are inimical to our ideology and to our notions of liberty and to our respect for human dignity and human rights. So let us reiterate the position that we took when we signed the petition requesting military help for defensive arms for Israel.

On that note I respectfully request that the Congress today let it be known by their vote on this amendment that it is the feeling of this Congress and we go on record saying we are interested in little people and in little nations all over the world.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that one of the important facts for us to remember today is that we are here considering legislation which simply grants authority to the executive department. One of the basic responsibilities of the executive department, as we all know, is the conduct of our foreign affairs. This cannot be done—nor should it be done—by the Congress of the United States.

Unless I am mistaken, our proper function today is to provide the executive branch with the authorization necessary to continue various programs which are essential to the security of the free world. Frankly, I would have preferred to see this bill give greater emphasis to economic-assistance programs for the underdeveloped nations of the world. It has become increasingly clear in recent years that the decisive battle in the cold war between the free world

and the Communist world will be waged in the economic and political arenas. Have-not nations today occupy a position absolutely unique in history. Their potential political potency, clearly demonstrated at Bandung, and their economic importance may well be one of the important chapters in the history of the last half of the 20th century.

Three weeks ago, President Sukarno, of Indonesia, delivered what I believe to be one of the most eloquent addresses in my experience. You will remember that he said:

Nationalism may be an out-of-date doctrine for many in this world; for us of Asia and Africa it is the mainspring of our efforts. Understand that, and you have the key to much of postwar history. Fail to understand it, and no amount of thinking, no torrent of words, and no Niagara of dollars will produce anything but bitterness and disillusionment.

President Sukarno was speaking of nationalism, Mr. Speaker, but implicit in his stirring message was the declaration that underdeveloped nations now consider political freedom and economic development to be matters of right—not grace.

I think that we will be shortsighted and blind, as a nation, if we do not understand the implications of this fact, and I think that our Government will be guilty of inexcusable shortsightedness and folly if our foreign policies do not reflect this understanding.

Frankly, it is my belief that this administration has been slow to grasp the implications of the vast power struggle in which we are now engaged, particularly in the political and economic areas. The Communist blueprint for infiltration of underdeveloped nations was made public at the 19th party congress, held in the Kremlin in 1952. And the course which was outlined has been scrupulously followed.

I do not agree with President Eisenhower on many matters, but I do concur with his statement that it would be tragic if Congress acquiesced in the \$1.1 billion foreign-aid cut recommended by a majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I am fearful, Mr. Chairman, that the actions taken by this body today may indicate a lack of responsiveness to a world trend which cannot be stemmed or altered. We must recognize the challenge before us and we must accept it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I share the concern felt by many of my colleagues at the hurried hugger-mugger way the administration has presented this foreign-aid bill to us in this Congress in these troubled times.

I harken back to remarks made by both the Secretary of State and the President, himself, wherein it is admitted not only that our foreign aid program is at best, not fully effective, but that there is need for a searching reappraisal of the whole program. I am going to vote for this bill, but with less than enthusiasm.



Now, Mr. Chairman, we have \$6 billion in appropriated funds already in the pipeline waiting to be spent. Those expenditures are for 2 years in advance. Certainly this reappraisal can go on while those vast funds are being spent, without the real need for additional funds, which can be later authorized and appropriated without peril either to the program or to the American people. But the administration tells us only that the funds must be authorized at once or the country is periled. That is surely being less than frank with the Congress and the people.

I have always felt that foreign aid, wisely used, was the best possible expenditure for the American people. It worked wonders under President Truman, and saved Western Europe, Turkey, Greece, and other lands from Communist enslavement.

My dear departed father was fighting for foreign aid and the mutual-security program when many whose voices I hear raised on behalf of this bill on the other side of the aisle were still calling such programs waste, boondoggling, and less printable names.

It appears to me, however, that this reappraisal late as it is must come soon, and I hope that the administration is wise enough to recognize that fact, lest they endanger the whole wonderful concept of foreign aid by maladministration and misadministration.

There are two features about this bill however, which are especially distasteful to me—the inclusion of Yugoslavia, and the Arabic States, both either avowed friends of the Kremlin, or announced enemies of the United States and world peace, and the long-established policy of the administration which will preclude arms for Israel under the bill. I need not say that Israel is a friend of America in a place and time where such things are as rare and precious as diamonds.

To address myself to the problem of Mr. Tito, already recipient of over \$1 billion in United States aid, who is presently engaged in a "love feast" with his fellow Communists in the Kremlin, I want to first recall to the membership of this House, how Mr. Tito has said that Russians and the Yugoslavs will never again be split.

We hear daily of other joint announcements from the intellectual descendants of Stalin who rule the Kremlin and this one-time friend of America, Tito, announcing to all how the Communists of the world are again united in a common goal. An aim, which we must presume from past Communist announcements to be the ultimate destruction of capitalism, and the destruction of our free American way of life.

Worse, Mr. Tito has been giving aid to the various Arab functionaries in their attempts to destroy both Israel and the peace of the world.

Just what is Mr. Tito's game? Let us analyze it with Mr. Constantine Brown as he does it in his excellent editorial of today's Washington (D. C.) Evening Star:

According to diplomatic observers in the Soviet capital, the renewal of permanent ties between the Soviet duumvirate and the

Yugoslav dictator will have important chain reactions which will be noticeable only as time goes on. Among these, it is believed, will be the creation of a new Danubian-Balkan confederation with Marshal Tito as its leader. This has been the Yugoslav dictator's dream for many years and was one of the reasons he stubbed his toe with Joseph Stalin. When he began to press this idea, "Uncle Joe" decided to cut him down to a boy's size. Fortunately for Tito, Uncle Sam was around the corner and rushed to his rescue.

I want to impress upon my colleagues, this danger is a very real one; and in the process of leading up to this program, Mr. Tito has made great strides. He visited France, and has traveled widely in other parts of the world, to India, Egypt, and Burma. Under America's aid his prestige has grown enormous, and I note during his travels, he has consorted with America's enemies, and has had nothing good to say about us "to boot."

As Mr. Brown so well says:

The idea of a Danubian-Balkan confederation within the Soviet orbit is not particularly new in the minds of the men in the Kremlin. It was one of the motives which prompted them to give Austria her full sovereignty in the hope that the little Danubian republic eventually might be forced by economic necessities to join Moscow's satellites.

I recall to my colleagues that no one who has visited this fair weather friend of ours in recent months has been sympathetic to the United States. Note well his politicking with the Egyptian leaders, and observe how he has abetted them in their avowed program for the extermination of the tiny State of Israel. He has been visited by Palmiro Togliatti, leader of the Italian Communist Party, and certainly no friend to America.

Thus the ultimate result of the present conferences between the Belgrade and the Kremlin leaders is expected to be that Marshal Tito will become the dominant figure not only in the Balkans but also in the strategically vital eastern Mediterranean.

This is the ambitious, grasping, "friend" whom we would aid, acting in the time honored custom of all dictators, Communist and otherwise. I say to this Congress that if we are foolish enough to send more arms to Tito, that they may not be entirely lost to the United States. No, indeed, we are very liable to become recipients of the buckshot, bombs, and baled hell that we send Tito sooner than we think. It may very well be used upon American boys, or the young men of countries which are our friends, or loosed upon us at home when we least expect it.

And now to return to an equally unpleasant subject, that of Egypt, which openly accepts arms from Russia and her satellites, and which more openly still announces that Egypt will not rest "until she has cut the Israeli cancer from the Arab heart." Certainly this is no friend and certainly no neutral.

This is one to whom we have extended not only the hand of peace, but to whom we have given vast sums of money, much material and technical aid. We are now in the process of competing with Russia to see whose help will Egypt accept in the construction of the \$200 million Aswan Dam. During this time, Egypt not only imports arms, but exploits inflammatory propaganda by all available

means, including radio, and printed matter, all aimed at hurting and embarrassing not only America but our allies, the British, the French, as well as the Israelis.

Let us use sense, let us reserve our aid for our friends, or for those whom we may hope will become friends.

Israel, however, our friend, an island of democracy and friendship in a sea of hostile Arabs, receives paltry little economic and technical aid, and no military aid worth discussing.

It is a rude shock to realize that with the present complexion of Arab strength and its anticipated growth that the time is not long hence when Israel, with her tiny size can be overrun before her friends could come to her aid.

I warn this administration that we are flirting with another Korea, which can happen at any time. Members of this House of Representatives, Members of our sister body, the Senate, citizens, and leaders in all walks of life have urged as a commonsense measure, that we send arms to Israel the arms which she may defend herself. These arms are not for offense, but only to protect those borders which are as sacred to Israel as our own are to us. I hope that the administration will heed the remarks of my colleagues and I who urge these arms, not for Israel only, but for my own protection and best interest.

I sincerely hope that Yugoslavia will be barred from any aid whatsoever. I will wholeheartedly support any amendment which will accomplish these ends.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the official facts and the equally official statements of administrative spokesmen made as recently as this past fall and early winter, I doubt that I am the only one among our colleagues to be amazed by the request of the Executive for funds with which to carry out United States foreign-aid programs in the fiscal year 1957.

On November 16, 1955, the press of the Nation—as reported by the ever-dependable New York Times—carried headlines to the effect that—

The administration has decided to hold back as much as 20 percent of this year's worldwide economic and technical assistance funds appropriated by Congress.

The New York Times article continued—and I quote:

The withheld money will go into an emergency reserve fund of about \$100 million. One of the countries affected is India, where a \$50 million economic development program approved by Congress will be trimmed to \$40 million. Development programs in the Middle East and in other parts of the world where they are linked with military defense programs will be cut by the International Cooperation Administration. If no emergencies arise, the funds could be returned to the programs before the end of the year, or they might be carried over to next year if Congress agrees. They also might be returned to the Treasury.

I wish particularly to call the attention of our colleagues to this statement in the Times article which—in view of subsequent testimony by certain top administration spokesmen before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House—is, I feel, highly illuminating.

The move—

The New York Times states—

was started by John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, who has made economy his watchword. He told a recent news conference that despite the threat of Soviet economic offensive, he was hopeful next year's aid program (the program which we are now debating on the floor of the House) could be cut below this year's \$2.7 billion.

The Washington Post and Times Herald likewise took note of the decision to withhold appropriated funds in the fiscal 1956 foreign-aid program in an editorial entitled "Penny-Wise Foreign Aid." Said the Post:

The reported division in the administration to hold back as much as 20 percent of the foreign-aid funds appropriated by Congress could not have been more badly timed. If the reports are true, this retrenchment in one of the most significant expressions of foreign policy comes at the very moment of the failure of the Geneva Conference, at the moment when the intensified Soviet economic push into the Middle East and Asia is becoming more and more obvious. In view of the bad psychological impact alone, it is hard to understand how either Secretary Dulles or the President could approve such a course.

The Post ends its editorial with the plaintive query:

Yet the International Cooperation Administration, whose Director has initiated the slash, is responsible to the Secretary of State. Does the left hand really know what the right hand is doing?

As quoted, Mr. Hollister was, I believe, being entirely consistent with the attitude which, in the past, he has maintained toward the foreign economic policies and foreign-aid programs of the present and previous administrations.

For, again referring to news reports in the press—which, like the great majority of the American people, is my principle source of information regarding the administration's foreign policies and practices—the New York Times on October 8, 1955, carried this headline: "Aid Cut Expected From United States Survey—End of European Program Seen and More Trims for Asia Are Anticipated."

Under a Washington dateline the New York Times then stated:

The beginning of the end of United States foreign-aid activities in Europe is expected to result from a survey now being made by John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration. Retrenchment is being planned in Asia, too.

Upon Mr. Hollister's return to Washington after a month's survey in Europe, the Far East, and the Middle East, the New York Times duly headlined: "Hollister Read To Act on Aid Cuts." Interviewed at the airport, the New York Times reports that in response to the question as to whether there were any areas of the Far East in which he thought foreign aid should be increased,

Mr. Hollister drew attention to these passages in his prepared statement:

We explained to the countries' leaders the limitations we must necessarily put on the total outlay for world assistance, and this requires careful planning of each country's program and strict allocations to appropriate projects.

At all points he said he had "emphasized the importance of encouraging the investment of private capital, both local and foreign, since Government aid should be considered only a method of priming the pump."

Against the background of such statements, the complete about-face and more-than-enthusiastic support given by the Director of ICA and other top administration spokesmen for the Departments of State and Defense in their testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, becomes all the more astounding.

Repeatedly throughout the testimony of these officials, Congress was urged to relegate more of its powers and control over the authorization and appropriation of funds for the purposes of the Mutual Security Act to the Executive. This, it is declared, would provide the greater flexibility needed by the Executive for the effective planning and administration of foreign-aid programs.

As to this, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that our principle difficulties arise from the fact that the administration has already exercised too much flexibility in these areas.

According to the evidence of Soviet progress and United States setbacks in the capitals of the world with which we are daily confronted, the fluctuating and vascillating course which the administration has pursued in its foreign economic policies during the past 3½ years, has gravely undermined our influence, lowered our prestige, and made mockery of our hitherto recognized leadership in world affairs.

If we are honest with ourselves, Mr. Chairman, can any Member of the House deny in good faith that we have lost the offensive and that the United States is now on the defensive on both economic and military grounds in the cold war?

In the past I have been proud to vote in support of this Nation's foreign aid programs. With justification I am proud of the inspired and—I might almost say—spiritual quality of the Democratic leadership which produced the Marshall plan, the ECA, and all the many other self-sacrificing acts of the American people to restore the ruined economies of Western Europe and to bring economic progress to the underprivileged nations of the free world.

Granted that some of these programs were also in defense of our own security. Nevertheless I feel that we have demonstrated time and time again our genuine altruism and sincere concern for the welfare, happiness, and independence of people everywhere.

Now, however, I have become convinced that a thorough reappraisal and complete review of the entire mutual security program is in order and should be completed before any increase in United States economic aid is forthcoming. It is not more flexibility and more

money to be expended that is required for the success of our relations with other free nations, but a return to the idealism which previously characterized our efforts to assist our allies and to strengthen the moral determination of the underprivileged and new-born nations to defend their liberty and improve their economies.

Over the past three and a half years we have experimented with bombast, bribery, and browbeating. We have swung from threats of "massive retaliation" and "agonizing reappraisals" to belated attempts to outbid the U. S. S. R.'s offers of military and economic assistance. The result has cost us friends and placed us in the ignominious position of being played, one against the other, in competition with Russia for the dubious loyalties of the strategic nations of the Near and Middle East.

I know whereof I speak. Back in 1954, Mr. Chairman, the great State of West Virginia was one of the major sufferers from the business recession which struck the country. The coal industry, one of the mainstays of the State's economy, was grievously hurt.

At one time during this period more than 13 percent of the State's total civilian labor force was unemployed and over 12 percent of its entire population required public assistance and surplus food to exist.

It was during this time that I personally encountered the full force of the administration's preach, promise, and do-nothing policies.

It was in the fall of 1954—and by some strange coincidence, at the height of the congressional election campaigns—that the then Director of the ICA's predecessor, the FOA, announced that his agency, at the direction of the President, would purchase, under the foreign aid program, 10 million tons of coal to relieve the distress of unemployment in the coal-producing regions of the United States.

With the hardship and suffering of the people of my own district staring me in the face, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I was among the first to appeal to Mr. Stassen for the allocation of orders to purchase some of this coal from the First Congressional District of West Virginia.

For the outcome of my efforts, the good faith with which the FOA/ICA kept its promise to the American people, and the inefficient administration of a Government agency which is now requesting authority to spend billions of the taxpayer's money, I refer you to the committee print, "Relief of Unemployment in Coal Mining Areas—Memorandum of Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oil, Gas and Coal," to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, dated February 15, 1956.

From out of the 10 million tons of coal promised to be purchased for export, at an estimated cost of \$150 million, only 1,130,080 tons, at a cost of \$34.2 million, was purchased—and this only under the most intensive congressional pressures—from September, 1954, until the program was unceremoniously and secretly abandoned by Mr. Stassen's successor, Mr. Hollister, in December 1955.



Despite their disappointment and disillusionment over the administration's failure to keep its commitment to them—and in the face of their own tribulations during this distressing time—the people of West Virginia continued, as they have in the past and as they most assuredly will do in the future, cheerfully and patiently to bear their share of the tax burden in which the cost of our foreign aid programs plays no small part.

Now the American people are being told that they must not only continue to bear this burden for an indeterminate time far into the future, but that its load must be radically increased.

In a message to the Congress of the United States on March 19, 1956, the President defined the urgency of the mutual security program to defer aggression and to help fortify the economies and military strength of the Nations of the free world. The need is urgent, he said, "because there are still people who aspire to sustain their freedom but confront economic obstacles that are beyond their capabilities of surmounting alone. We must continue to work with other countries to insure that each free nation remains free, secure from external aggression and subversion, and able to develop a society marked by human welfare, individual liberty, and a rising standard of living." Would that the Administration could see as clearly the scope of our own domestic difficulties in coping with these problems here, at home.

In requesting authority of the Congress to make commitments up to 10 years in length to achieve these purposes, the President said that we should be able to assure the nations of the free world that we will continue to participate in a number of military projects and enterprises which will take a number of years to complete.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that, with reference to the appropriation of funds for United States aid of long-range foreign development projects, the time has come to take a much closer look at our own domestic needs in these areas. We are asked to give and to lend our support for the construction of road networks, harbor developments, and power and water resources projects among others.

In the First District of West Virginia, two lock and dam construction projects, authorized by Congress, have been underway for several years. In each year that I have been in Congress it has been necessary for members of the West Virginia delegation to go before the appropriate committees of Congress to request the appropriation of funds to carry out the work on these dams on a year-to-year basis. Moreover, every year we have had to wrestle with the Bureau of the Budget to assure that these projects were not left out of the Executive's request for civil function project funds.

Nationwide, the need for an adequate system of interstate highways and the appropriation of funds, on a year-to-year basis, to carry forward the regular Federal highway aid programs have been problems with which the Congress has wrestled through many a session.

We are still faced with serious and mounting deficiencies of teachers and

classrooms for the proper education of our American youth.

And for the protection of the Nation's health and the conservation of its water resources, there will soon come to the floor of the House a bill to amend the Water Pollution Control and Flood Prevention Act. Many of our colleagues have endeavored for years to secure a sufficient appropriation of funds and an effective program of Federal aid to assist our States and local communities in coping with these pressing problems.

I believe that the time has come when Congress' first responsibility is to the American taxpayer—to the improvement of his standard of living, to the meeting of his needs, and—in keeping with the promises of candidate Eisenhower during the 1952 campaigns—to consideration of the right of the average citizen to receive, to control, and to spend as he pleases a little more of the money he has earned to provide for himself and his family.

I earnestly pray that the day will never come when this Nation will refuse the friendly gesture and helping hand to assist another country maintain its freedom and improve its economic circumstances.

Nevertheless, it is high time, I feel, that we attacked our own family problems and with greater vigor pursued more aggressively our program for domestic improvement, before we expend so large a percentage of our energies and our resources for these purposes in foreign fields.

Perhaps when we practice the ideals of democracy at home as fervently as we preach its virtues abroad, we shall have found a far superior way to win friends and influence people than the methods we have lately been following.

I wish most heartily to commend the distinguished chairman and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House for their realistic approach to the problem of this country's continued foreign-aid program and for the courage with which they have dealt with it.

The American people are indeed indebted for the forthright service which the committee has thereby rendered the Nation.

It is my intention to support the committee's action and to vote in favor of the cuts in the aid program which they have approved and recommended to the Members of the House.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, the discussion in the United Nations Security Council this week on the British resolution that expressed the hope for a lasting peace in the Middle East has shown to the whole world once again that the Arab countries have no desire to reach a peaceful settlement with Israel. The spokesman for the Arab countries, Syrian Ambassador Ahmed Shukairy, frankly stated:

We must begin from the beginning. . . . The establishment of Israel, its membership in the United Nations, and all other resolu-

tions will have to be revoked. Then, and then only, the United Nations can look forward to a solution on a mutually acceptable basis.

In other words, the Arab States insist on nothing less than the annihilation of Israel and of wiping out the Israelis by driving them into the Mediterranean Sea. This means that the present cease fire is only of a temporary nature and is bound to flare up again in the near future when the Arabs will feel the moment as opportune.

Mr. Chairman, let us keep this well in mind as we are about to vote economic and military assistance for the countries in the Near East. The military balance of this strategic area, which is so vital to our defense structure, has already been upset by Egypt's action in the past year in giving Soviet Russia a foothold in the Middle East. On several occasions during recent months I have urged our Government to adopt a firmer policy in the Middle East and to end its policy of appeasement of the Arabs. The more we appease the Arabs, the less they support us. The more material aid, economic and military, we give to Egypt, to Saudi Arabia, to Syria, and to the other Arab States, the less respect they seem to have for us.

It is high time that we adopt this firmer stand, before hostilities and bloodshed are renewed by the Arabs in the Middle East. They are acquiring arms in huge quantities from the Soviet bloc and from other sources. With each passing week they are becoming more trigger happy and sooner or later will pounce upon Israel. This is the time to make available to Israel the necessary arms for legitimate self-defense in the event of aggression from her Arab neighbors. It does not make sense to provide arms to Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries, as we have done in recent weeks and months, while refusing to sell arms to Israel for purposes of defense.

The policy we are pursuing now is not one of impartiality, but it constitutes a very definite and decidedly partial pro-Arab attitude. This is not the traditional American policy in that area and should be discarded as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we eliminate from the bill under discussion all economic and military aid to the Arab countries of the Near East until they show a willingness to reach a peaceful solution with Israel. I strongly urge that we should not appropriate a single cent to Egypt, to Saudi Arabia, to Syria, and to the other Arab countries because they have betrayed the cause of the free world by their actions in making possible Russia's intrusion into the Middle East. At the same time, I urge that we should not ignore Israel's present plight when its very existence is being threatened by aggressive neighbors and that we appropriate the necessary military aid for her legitimate self-defense.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed

by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dobb] to increase by \$5 million the amount of defense support for Latin America from \$32 million to \$37 million, with the understanding that the additional \$5 million be given to Guatemala.

Not only as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but also as chairman of its Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have heard testimony many times convincing me that in Guatemala we have a friend worth having on the side of the free world. Here we have a country who actually has been challenged by the Communists, and who has met that challenge with honor and success. Here we have a country in the Western Hemisphere who has demonstrated its determination to fight and keep free of Communist subversion and domination. We must surely agree that such an enemy of subversion and domination should know our respect and admiration.

When a special study mission to Central America on international organizations and movements, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, chairmanned by the Honorable A. S. J. CARNAHAN, of which I was a member, visited Guatemala last year, we were informed during a conference with the President, as stated in the report of that study mission—page 15:

It was the avowed program of the Government to use democratic processes to the fullest extent. The President further stated that it was his desire to prove to the millions of enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain that Guatemala, under democratic government, could provide the decent standard of living which the Communists promised but as usual did not fulfill.

The money we give Guatemala will not be just a gratuitous offering; it will serve a good purpose. It will assist Guatemala, who needs help, as stated by the Assistant Secretary of State for Guatemalan Affairs, Hon. Henry F. Holland, when he testified before our committee on this program:

The pro-Communist Arbenz government left Guatemala with an empty treasury and a severe unemployment problem. In response to the resulting threat of economic crisis, the United States has been assisting the government in carrying out a number of projects designed to restore normal economic conditions and to promote further economic development.

Urgently needed highway and hospital projects, a rural development program, and a planned area development program are among the most significant of the efforts to mobilize the country's varied economic resources and to demonstrate the government's ability to accomplish major improvements as to which the Communist regime has been unsuccessful. No new activities are contemplated in the coming fiscal year, but the continuation of the projects now in progress is of extreme importance to Guatemala's program of recovery.

Let us show our friends in the Western Hemisphere that we are not fair weather friends. Let us recognize Guatemala's battle for freedom. Let us give Guatemala this help which she needs and deserves.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the historic debate that has marked the consideration by this body of the bill now before us, sitting as Committee of the Whole, it has been most heartening to hear mention made of the interest of our people in the State of Israel and of our moral responsibility to do all in our power and within our means to safeguard Israel from the dangers that beset her.

Mr. Chairman, it is not within human power to stop progress. The birth and the growth of nations are determined by laws that some may style the natural laws but most of us accept as the laws of a guiding divinity. The State of Israel is much in the same position in which the colonies that later became the States of the American Union found themselves when they had brought the progress of a new civilization into an area held backward by the practices of a dying order. The State of Israel, as I view this young nation of valiant pioneers, is destined in the future to occupy a position of greatness exceeding even the imaginations of her well-wishers. Israel is our hope for tomorrow in an area where now democracy as we know it is beset by many dangers.

Israel will bring into that area where now there is only confusion, and where man has never had the opportunity of attaining the full stature of his dignity, a broadening of the horizons of life for all the peoples therein residing. This I believe. This I have the faith is as certain as that with the passing of tonight, tomorrow morning another day will dawn. The children and the grandchildren and the great-grandchildren of the Arab people in the enjoyment of the blessings of progress ushered in by the State of Israel will give thanks that Israel came into being and through surmounting many dangers endured.

It has been well said that it is part of the character of the American people, part I would say of our mission, always to give a helping hand to the small nations of the world. This is as natural as that a grown man or woman should help a child to exercise and to grow so that when the elder person had grown fatigued with the chores of living another should be ready and developed to take their place. Our own United States of America was once a small nation. Now the responsibility of world power has been given us. In the exercise of this responsibility let us always be guided by the thought that progress is part of growth and that in a nation now young and small may tomorrow be the instrumentality of still greater progress in man's eternal march upward toward the heights.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dobb].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHRISTOPHER: Page 2, line 18, strike "\$882,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$382,000,000."

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by praising the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House for what I consider an excellent job which they have done with the mutual-security bill. I would not offer this amendment if it were not for the flexibility that is in this bill and the tremendous amount of funds that they already have in the carryover.

The figures I have are taken from estimates by the International Cooperation Administration. I suppose they are as reliable as can be found, because they are from the administration that is administering foreign aid. They say that the military carryover at the present time is \$5 billion. Nonmilitary carryover, \$1.8 billion. The 1957 appropriations under existing authority, \$187,500,000. Of course the administration has asked for \$4,672,475,000 which this committee cut to \$3,563,475,000. So we come up with these figures:

If the administration's requests were granted as it came before the committee, the foreign-aid program, so-called, June 30, 1956, would have authorization and appropriated funds totaling \$11,659,975,000. But if we support the bill as it came from the committee and add nothing to it or take anything away, the mutual-security program would have \$10,550,975,000. If my amendment is agreed to they will still have \$10,050,975,000, after we have saved a half billion dollars today.

I like to look at my own country, the United States. Everything we touch is taxed. Every bite we eat is taxed. Every garment we put on our bodies is taxed. Our transportation is taxed. The land, the salary check that we earn, the gasoline that we burn, the electricity we use, the water we drink—there is not anything in these United States that is not taxed. I do not like to see our money thrown indiscriminately all over the world. I have voted consistently on the floor of this House for this mutual aid program, because I have been told it is being used for the protection of our own country but this program has been in operation for many years and no one seems to have any idea when, if ever, we may be able to dispense with or even reduce it.

I have a bill now being considered before the Veterans' Affairs Committee to give war veterans a small pension when they reach age 65. This bill is said to cost \$500 million per year if enacted. Here is the place to get the money and not injure anyone.

I still intend to support the committee and vote for it again, but the time may come and that rather soon if I continue to stay in this House, where I will do like some of my colleagues have assured me today they are going to do: Vote for every amendment to reduce the bill and then in the end vote against the bill. I am fast getting to that place.

Look at our own country: Our rivers are not leveed, our land is not terraced,



our land is not limed; we do not have enough schoolrooms for our children; we do not have enough teachers to teach them; we do not have enough hospitals to put our sick to bed.

Look at our rivers, look at our own river right here, the Potomac, that flows between Washington, D. C. and Arlington, Va. Is it a river? No, it is not a river, it is a cesspool, and you all know it. Do not tell me nothing can be done about it. The Army Engineers know what to do with that river to clean it up and make it clear and make it beautiful like the streams are up in the Appalachian Mountains where they are only little creeks; they know what to do about it. Ask why they do not do it and they say: "Oh, it is going to cost so much money."

We never will have any sense of money values or any incentive to be frugal or to guard the taxpayers' money so long as we continue to throw away our resources all over the world. It will never be done in this House or anywhere else in this Government as long as we continue to throw billions and billions of dollars a year into Europe, Asia, and Africa.

I wonder how many of my colleagues from the South want to irrigate the Sahara to raise long staple cotton? It is planned to do this with our money.

I hope this amendment is accepted.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment would cut out half a billion dollars of the \$882 million of defense support for Asia.

If you turn to page 15 of the committee report you will see the countries that are involved. There are 4 amounts that are classified, but there are 4 that are given, and they total \$441 million.

This is defense support to help maintain forces in Korea, where they have 20 divisions under arms; \$300 million is needed for Korea to help them maintain the economy and pay for their gigantic military effort, to help them continue to rehabilitate themselves from their war losses and to develop so they can become more self-supporting.

There is \$25 million for the Philippines. There is \$86 million for Taiwan, Formosa, where 10 million people are maintaining the free China that we recognize maintaining land and naval forces sufficient to defend themselves against imminent Communist invasion.

There is \$30 million for Thailand. For Vietnam the amount is classified, but, as we know, this heroic, brandnew, magnificent little country of South Vietnam, after Vietnam was cut in two by the surrender which was carried out at Geneva, is maintaining itself in spite of pessimistic reports, under their indomitable President Diem, and maintaining the military force there which it is hoped will resist the force that is building up illegally in North Vietnam.

That is the sort of thing this amendment would absolutely stop, would paralyze. I do not think that the Committee of the Whole wants to stop the resistance to Red Chinese communism in Asia. This amendment would certainly do that. The amendment includes Pakistan, that country that stands stoutly with us.

Economic support for other military forces is involved. These are items that would be completely emasculated if the pending amendment were adopted.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Is it not a fact that the flexibility in this bill allows these funds to be transferred anywhere the President and his associates want to transfer them and is it not also a fact that even if the amendment prevailed they would still have over \$10 million to spend in 1957?

Mr. VORYS. No. On this flexibility business, you cannot use flexibility to spend the same money more than once. Our chairman, in arguing for the reduction in military aid, has mentioned the importance of the flexibility provision. There is not enough flexibility in this bill to carry out the necessary military changes and then to restore any such amount as a half billion dollars in one fell swoop in one area of the world for defense support. Flexibility covers a multitude of sins but it cannot cover this half billion dollar cut.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Then it must be a fact this bill was designed by some able lawyers so that you could not get anything out of it without destroying it, is that a fact?

Mr. VORYS. This bill is designed so that you cannot get something for nothing.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is what I want to know. I do not want to get something for nothing.

Mr. VORYS. This bill is designed, as I said, on the basis that you cannot get something out of nothing. That is the only kind of bill we could have. In order to carry on this program, this program of defense support, you have to have the money to do it with. If you take out money all through the bill then you do not have enough money to transfer under your flexibility provision.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I am leaving you \$10 million. That is something.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio and if I understand the amendment correctly, it will cut \$500 million of defense support from the countries in Asia that are our staunchest allies; nations that are on the very perimeter surrounding the Communist-bloc countries. If we really want to swing a meat ax and cut off \$500 million and thereby punch ourselves squarely in the nose, vote for this amendment. Nothing could be worse for our interests, nothing could hurt us more. I cannot think of any action that could be more damaging to our collective security.

The proposed amendment would cut out defense support for our friendly allies, the Philippines, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, Pakistan, Cambodia, and Korea, where we have spent millions of dollars in the past to stop communism. Nothing could be more disastrous to our

interests and to our security than to vote for this amendment.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I certainly agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman has had to say. It was my privilege to visit all the free nations of north and southeast Asia last fall. Those countries are doing a marvelous job in the common fight for freedom and liberty. To cut off or reduce aid to these countries would be a hard blow at freedom's cause and a slap in the face for our friends. I certainly hope that the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for his observation. If there is any doubt, I urge the Members to refer to page 15 of the report, the paragraph above the italics "Latin America" and read that, I do not see how anyone could possibly vote for this amendment. The committee clearly emphasizes the reason for the defense support authorization.

Korea and Formosa—Taiwan—provide large armies directly confronting Communist forces. Neither country has an adequate economic base. Pakistan lies close to the Soviet Union and has joined the Baghdad Pact. It is essential that the United States give full assistance to its effort to meet the Soviet threat. Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam are trying to establish themselves as independent nations and to defend themselves against the continued danger from their Communist neighbors. The Philippines has to maintain a military force adequate to maintain internal security and at the same time perform the important assignment in the defense of the Pacific area which its strategic location dictates. The free world orientation of Thailand, its position in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—and the effectiveness of its military organization combine to make it one of the most influential small nations in Asia.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I believe the distinguished gentleman, if he had fully understood the import of what he was trying to do, probably would not have offered this amendment. I think the money he seeks to cut out here is probably some of the most essential in this bill. The committee said in its report that there can be no question but that all of the countries that are to receive defense support authorized here are poor countries, like Korea and the Philippines. It does not refer to India but countries like that who have great defense establishments themselves, and their economy is not strong enough to keep them up. We would be cutting off our noses to spite our faces if this amendment was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY of New York: Page 3, after line 4, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 4. Title I, chapter 4, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which contains general provisions relating to mutual defense assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 143. Prohibition of assistance to Yugoslavia.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the date of the enactment of this section."

And renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the Members of the House of Representatives who has sponsored this type of amendment for the past 5 years. My concern dates back to 1951 when I visited Yugoslavia as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Study to Europe. My interest in this amendment is not new and I would like to add at this point the names of those who have supported this action—if they so desire.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to join the gentlewoman in sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DORN of New York. I would be glad also to join as a sponsor of this amendment.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that this action is necessary. This amendment is simple to understand but it is broad in scope.

It cuts off all new money earmarked for Yugoslavia and it prohibits the delivery of any material or aid under previous legislation.

If this amendment prevails, huge, classified, unexpended balance earmarked for Yugoslavia will be restored for distribution elsewhere, thereby markedly decreasing the cut made by the committee.

Why do I sponsor this amendment?

First. I believe that the break of Tito with the U. S. S. R. was not sincere.

Second. Tito said in Moscow recently, "Yugoslavia will never again be split from the Soviet Union by misunderstanding." Therefore, he has no need for military aid. He knows the United States will not be an aggressor, and he now believes the Soviet will not attack him. He needs no military supplies.

Third. I believe that Tito has played his part as a Communist brilliantly and cunningly. No other man has helped to weaken NATO and break up the unity of the West. He refused to take part in NATO yet, at the same time, he has received more aid than any other single nation. He has spread neutralism—agreeing with the Soviets and Red China and condemning every action of the West. Still, he received assistance.

Fourth. He defined the West in Trieste, to which he had no claim, bringing the Communist world into the Adriatic and thus into the Mediterranean.

Fifth. Did he play a part in the Czech arms deal with Egypt? I believe he did.

Sixth. He certainly made the Balkan pact a paper alliance.

Seventh. He has encouraged the Greek-Turkish dispute.

Eighth. He has magnetized the people of Greece to his side, thereby completing the neutral nation bloc from the Baltic to the Adriatic to the Mediterranean, Moscow, Belgrade, Athens, Egypt.

The NATO of Europe has begun. This, Moscow has sought a long time.

Arguments against this amendment are going to be:

Help Yugoslavia remain independent. She is.

Keep Yugoslavia away from the Communists. She is there.

Do not hurt the Yugoslav people. They are hurt. They are enslaved. They have no freedom.

I will vote for economic aid to the Yugoslav people directly—as I have in the past—provided we can distribute that aid to them.

Finally, I believe that this amendment should be adopted in order to prove to the world that we will aid our friends but not those who work to undermine the principles which have made the United States the nation it is.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Brooklyn and say that I associate myself with her in her remarks; I supported her amendment last year and shall do so again this year.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from New York on her forthright and sincere expression on this subject. I shall support this amendment. As a matter of fact, I have an amendment which I shall offer later on which will go a little further to exclude aid not only to Yugoslavia but to India, and Egypt, as well. I think all of these countries have shown their pro-Soviet tendencies, and they are not entitled to the support of this country.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. SISK), Mrs. KELLY of New York was given 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to join the gentlewoman from New York in her amendment, and I support the amendment because I certainly believe

it to be equitable and just. Certainly to me it is most unfair to continue to pour money into a country which is today back in the Communist orbit. As the gentlewoman has suggested and as I believe, Yugoslavia probably never was out of the Communist orbit. So I am very happy to support the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I also wish to commend the gentlewoman from New York for offering this amendment.

I wonder if the members of the committee have been reading the news reports out of Moscow in the last few days. Apparently someone has brought to the attention of Marshal Tito the fact that attempts may be made here to eliminate all of our aid as far as he is concerned. He has been quoted in the press as saying that it is not important, that "our friendship with the United States will remain regardless of these attempts." I suppose you might say regardless of whether he is going to get any aid or not.

I notice also he expresses the desire to visit Washington in the next few months. I am wondering if that is also going to be in the cards.

Seriously, I saw on the ticker just outside a while ago that in Moscow he has signed a trade protocol with the Soviet Union, another example of how closely he is alining himself with the Kremlin at this particular time.

In discussing this matter of aid to Yugoslavia, Mr. Chairman, I think it sort of almost completes the circle that our foreign-aid program has taken in the last few years. When the Marshall plan was originally conceived the Soviet satellites, including Yugoslavia, were all invited to participate. They turned it down. Then we decided we were going to give aid only to our actual allies and our potential allies. Now we are aiding the underdeveloped areas, including the neutralist states, including pro-Soviet states. Continued aid to Yugoslavia under present conditions would be aiding frankly open enemies. I wonder if the next step after aiding Yugoslavia is going to be an offer of aid to the Soviet Union itself, thereby, as I say, completing the circle.

With regard to Tito, I would like to make a few personal comments. I remember Marshal Tito from firsthand experience. I first saw him back in December of 1947, about 6 months before he broke with the Cominform. At that time, and that was only a year, I believe the committee will recall, after he had shot down two American planes, he was hand in glove with members of the Kremlin. The break came 6 months later in June of 1948. I believe the break was genuine. I happened to be living in Eastern Europe at that time. On that basis I supported aid to Tito for a number of years. I even spoke before groups which were avowedly anti-Tito. But all that policy has changed with the death of Stalin.

Today I am firmly convinced that Marshal Tito is back as strongly in the Soviet camp as he was prior to June 1948,



and will remain there regardless of what we do or do not do.

I would also call your attention to one more thing, and that is also, I believe, on the ticker today. Certain prominent Yugoslav emigre leaders testifying before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the other body this morning stated, as I recall the news ticker, that American aid to Tito had been a disaster to their country, that it had created consternation behind the Iron Curtain on the part of people who could not understand our policy of building up the Communist dictatorship, that it had created consternation among the people we are trying to help, the people of Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, to say nothing of the people of Yugoslavia, itself. They said it was a disaster as far as the entire list of Communist-enslaved peoples were concerned. They sincerely and earnestly hoped that this aid would be terminated and terminated immediately.

They also said one more thing, which I want very strongly to call to the attention of the committee, particularly the Members on my right, and that is they stated categorically that all of the assistance that had gone to Egypt in the past several months in the way of military aid, aid which has so deeply concerned many Members of this House, had been shipped from Czechoslovakia to Egypt via Yugoslavia.

So you can see what kind of friend Marshal Tito is, not only to us but to our allies, such as Israel and those other countries who are trying to remain free.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENTLEY was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If this money is left in for Yugoslavia and Yugoslavia refuses to take it, do you suppose it would be forced upon them?

Mr. BENTLEY. I am sure the attempts of the administration to force Tito to accept it will be very great.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. You should have heard what Tito said. He recited a little couplet:

Those to us who aid do send  
See no further than the end of their nose.

Mr. BENTLEY. That is a good idea of Tito's opinion of us. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the last 2 years I have introduced an amendment cutting off aid for Tito's Yugoslavia. I made a public announcement a couple of days ago, and also stated on the floor here yesterday, that I was going to introduce such an amendment again this year. At that time I was advised that no member of

the Foreign Affairs Committee or Member of the House was going to offer such an amendment. But now I notice that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] has offered an amendment which is identical with the one which I laid on the Speaker's desk when we convened this morning. I am very happy to take this opportunity to urge support for this amendment, because it will put an end to the misuse of taxpayers' money to feather the nest of the Communist dictator Tito. I urge support of this amendment for the following reasons:

It will put an end to the farcical situation in which the American taxpayer is required to pay a large part of the military preparedness bill of an avowed enemy of the United States, Communist dictator Tito.

Secondly, it will bring the foreign-aid program back closer to its original purpose of strengthening the friends of freedom, thwarting the conspiracy of communism, and protecting the security of the American people.

Third, it will save the American taxpayers some money by prohibiting the use of public funds for purposes calculated to advance the evil plan of world Marxist civilization, over which the Russians expect to rule with their typical disregard for humanity.

Fourth, it will put Congress on record as being aware of the obvious fact that there is only one type of Communist, and that all Communists, when the cards are down, will give their wholehearted loyalty to no one but the Communist central authority in Moscow.

Fifth, it will serve notice to the world that the United States refuses to reward nations who publicly pledge their loyalty to communism with large sums of money taken from the American taxpayer's till.

Sixth, it will send up a warning to all those nations now sitting on the fence of the cold war that they cannot maintain a character of neutralism by visiting Moscow or inviting the Kremlin barkers to visit their country. A visit to Moscow or a cozy reception for Bulganin and Khrushchev puts them firmly in the camp of world communism.

Seventh, it will prevent the free world alliances built up after years of great effort and expense from falling apart by making it clear that we have not gone soft on communism and that we regard human freedom and national independence as the only bond which can bind us to other nations.

Eighth, it will deter other still free nations from going soft on communism by taking action which demonstrates that we have not been taken in by the latest Kremlin game of sweetness and light and that we propose to assist only those nations whose leadership is equally aware of this latest Russian beartrap.

Ninth, it will restore a large measure of our national dignity which has been degraded in the past by allowing this Communist carpetbagger dictator, Tito, to slap us in the face before we reward him with a large helping of the largess extracted from the American taxpayer.

Tenth, it will provide the Congress with an opportunity to tell the world it is aware that no Communist can be a neutral in the cold war, because every

Communist, regardless of his hue, must be dedicated to the world triumph of communism and the defeat of free institutions, representative governments, and the basic freedoms. This is a hard cold fact of life. There are, in my judgment, governments in this world which honestly seek a neutral position in the cold war, but none of them is or can be Communist. Every Communist is first a Communist and only a neutral if and when that role serves the Communist blueprint for world conquest.

Finally, the enactment of this amendment will herald the beginning of a new era of foreign assistance programs in which the governing criteria will put freedom's cause above all others.

I urge every Member to support this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey to the amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY of New York: Insert after "enactment of this section" a comma and the following: "unless the President finds (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, and (2) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this amendment retains the prohibition of aid to Yugoslavia contained in the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York, but adds that if the President affirmatively finds after study that Yugoslav policies have not changed, as we fear today, and that Yugoslavia is still independent of the Soviet Union; and further, if the President affirmatively finds that it continues to be in the national security interest of this country to furnish aid, then it can be given.

I am sure that over the years when aid has been given to Yugoslavia it certainly did not mean that we supported a government regime in that country. We felt, however, that this country that had broken away from the Soviet orbit should be encouraged to stay out of the clutches of Russia; and I am sure it was for those reasons that we did support through aid to Yugoslavia her independence of Russia.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. As one lawyer to another can we agree that this bill gives complete discretion to the Executive to spend most of the money in this bill as, where, and when he sees fit?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There certainly is a great deal of flexibility.

Mr. DONOVAN. If that be true, is not the language in the gentleman's amendment merely a glorified statement that takes all of the meat out of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. No; I do not believe that is true.

Mr. DONOVAN. Well, actually, what you say is, "provided the President finds out or determines that it is all right to continue to do business with Tito," is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say that we are fearful, hope is dimming that Yugoslavia will stay independent of Russia.

Mr. DONOVAN. Again as one lawyer to another, that is not precisely in answer to the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the gentleman will bear with me, I hope I can explain what I consider to be the import of the amendment.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman's amendment, in substance, says if the President finds out that Tito is on the up-and-up he can still keep giving him money; is that not so?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the President finds it is in the national security of this country to furnish aid, he may.

Mr. DONOVAN. And, on the other hand, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York proposes that it is the will of this House that Tito is unworthy of credence and confidence. What the gentleman actually is doing is giving back to the President of the United States the power to decide whether he is going to give aid to Tito.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say to the gentleman that events of the past week have created great anxiety and fear that Yugoslavia is slipping back under the Soviet umbrella. The President suggested, and I agree with him, that we should not act precipitously, that we should study, then decide. That is what would allow the President to do. It would allow him to know more about what is happening in Yugoslavia.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. As one lawyer to another, would not the gentleman say that his amendment requires two findings that the President must make, and if he does not make those findings aid to Yugoslavia is cut off?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. There are no such requirements in this law or any other law at the present time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. These are two new specific requirements that the gentleman's amendment would place upon the President. It would require him to make findings and if he does not so find, then aid is cut off?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I wish the gentleman would explain to me how the President of the United States or anyone in this hemisphere could make a positive determination that Tito and his Government are not under the domination of

the Soviet Union? How could that be done?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure that is the kind of determination that is made all the time; that is, by analyzing the policies of nations.

Mr. VORYS. A number of our brethren here on the floor yesterday and today have been able to make determinations on that basis partly on what they have remembered from reading a ticker tape.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Does the gentleman not feel it is a gross imposition upon President Eisenhower to ask him to make a finding of fact which should be obvious to each and every one of us right now. We should not ask the President to make a finding that Congress itself would not make and which would be contrary to the national interest. Congress should not throw its "hot potatoes" to President Eisenhower. Congress should decide these matters on their merits and there is abundant evidence for us to make the decision now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As I interpret the President's statement yesterday, that is what he was suggesting, that he had to study it and make a finding of fact.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to explain my vote in favor of a cut of \$1.1 billion as recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as my vote this afternoon in favor of \$500,000 assistance for the Republic of Guatemala. I believe that both of these votes indicate some of the questions that have recently been in my mind regarding foreign aid as well as some of the conclusions to which I have drawn regarding the entire program.

Mr. Chairman, in recent days a number of questions regarding this whole matter of foreign-aid spending have been running through my mind. As a result, I have come to the conclusion that perhaps the time has come to reevaluate and to restudy the entire program. I think we should ask ourselves, first of all, if the program is accomplishing in broad measure what it is intended to accomplish. I feel that it is time for constructive criticism of a program which has been in existence for 10 years and which was inaugurated to meet a crisis which has drastically altered in form in the last decade. I believe that this is true, although I supported foreign aid when it was first introduced by President Truman, and I have always voted for its continuance when it was considered in other years by Congress. However, I have come to question whether the foreign-aid program, as it now stands and as it was presented to Congress this year, is needed in 1956.

Mr. Chairman, my suspicions of this program grow when one considers that the foreign-aid program as we have come to know it was instituted to meet the world economic crisis which resulted from World War II. The Truman administration initiated foreign aid in order to help many of the countries which were then flat on their backs. You will recall that many of these nations had

just emerged from the war to find their economies destroyed—their transportation systems ruined and thousands of people unemployed. We decided on foreign aid at this point because we wanted to help the rest of the world get back on its feet, and because we knew that foreign aid was necessary to stop the spread of communism which was capitalizing on postwar economic chaos.

However, as we all know, conditions in the world have changed drastically since that time. Many of my colleagues in Congress, for example, have returned from trips abroad to relate that many of the countries which have benefited from foreign aid are now enjoying greater prosperity than they did in the years before the war. They saw many other positive results of our foreign-aid spending and I think that we should be grateful that the money has been so often put to good use. However, since many of these countries we originally helped have obviously recovered to a great extent, perhaps the time has come to ask ourselves how long we should be expected to continue with foreign aid. It may be that we should be thinking now in terms of diverting our money to other useful and constructive channels. These and other questions have bothered me.

In recent years, for example, I have not been in agreement with the tendency to place such a heavy emphasis on military aid rather than on technical assistance. I, for one, do not believe that you can buy friends throughout the world with guns. I do feel however, that we can win friends by providing other peoples with tools, books and know-how, so that they can raise their own standards of living and generally progress. I have always felt that such assistance was a positive approach to this whole foreign aid program and money well spent by the United States. I am reluctant to attempt to win friends abroad with armaments, because I have so often seen it demonstrated in history, that frequently these same armaments are used against the donor. I think that a study of political realities in many parts of the world would alert us to the fact that such an eventuality cannot be excluded in the future, however distasteful it may be to contemplate.

Mr. Chairman, I also believe that we should ask ourselves whether or not our foreign-aid program as it now stands is flexible enough to meet the challenges of the present day and age. For example, in light of recent world events, I think that we should question whether or not foreign aid provides an adequate means of meeting the new Soviet economic challenge. I believe we should question whether parts of our program are not geared to outmoded concepts. Are we, for example, encouraging governments to undertake military and economic burdens which they may have difficulty supporting on their own? Has, as one writer put it, the machinery of the aid program become self-perpetuating and is it so cumbersome that it tends to obscure the objective? Are we, too, for example, spending money on direct grants to foreign countries when low-



interest loans might be better received and make more friends for us?

In view of these and other questions which I cannot go into here, I would like to suggest that the Nation as a whole take another look at the entire foreign-aid program. I believe that the program's military structure as well as its economic structure ought to be scrutinized from top to bottom. I believe that a thorough examination would have a very salutary effect on the foreign aid program, itself. Perhaps we would find, for example, that many of the questions raised about it stem from the fact that there has been no dispassionate, expert look at where we want to go with our foreign aid program and how we got there. A study by both the executive branch and by Congress would help to clear up many of the doubts many of us have about the program and I think serve a very useful and helpful purpose.

I would like to propose, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the President be urged to set up an independent and bipartisan commission to study the entire foreign-aid program. I also believe that Congress should appoint a committee to be made up of Members from both sides of the aisle to investigate and study the entire question of foreign aid. I feel that such a committee would be able to determine just what has been accomplished in the past as well as the road which the country wishes to follow in the future.

Mr. Chairman, having raised all these questions which were in my mind regarding the program, I find it impossible to vote in favor of a retention of \$1.1 billion in this foreign aid authorization bill. I think the reasoning which prompted my decision to vote for a cut as recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee is obvious in view of what I have just said. My vote in favor of a \$500,000 assistance for Guatemala, I believe, demonstrates that I am still in favor of foreign aid in those areas where I feel it can be put to the best use to develop a country economically and fight the spread of communism effectively.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### MRS. ANNA ELIZABETH DOHERTY

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 247) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 1913) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of*

*the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following corrections: In line 5 of the enrolled bill strike out the figures "3,613.30" and insert in lieu thereof "3,116.70"; and in line 10, strike out "October 31" and insert in lieu thereof "September 30."*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RABAUT, PASSMAN, NATCHER, CANNON, WILSON of Indiana, JAMES, and TABER.

#### THE YUGOSLAV AND CENTRAL EUROPEAN ISSUE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to request permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the Yugoslav and Central European issue.

The issue is not Tito. It is the mutual security of the United States and the 100 million Christians in Central Europe. These people form a string of nations from the Baltic to the Adriatic. Yugoslavia is the base of this group.

In World War II, each of these nations was picked off one by one. Organized in one block, they might well form a unit of strength to balance the future peace of the East and the West, in Europe and in Asia.

You want self-determination, Woodrow Wilson gave it to the people of Central Europe but he did not give them any strategic defense nor any interlocking defense commitments.

I do not say it is better to deal with neutrals. But let me put it this way. Do you want to deal with neutrals or with satellites?

In our own interest, the people of Central Europe should trust us and believe in our friendship.

Although Germany was our enemy in World War II, today we do not penalize the German Nation for what Hitler and the Nazis did. We believe that by helping the Germans today, we are helping them build a new future based on true democracy.

Tito is as mortal as Hitler was. He is a Communist. We are not. But the Yugoslav people fought on our side during World War II. They were our Allies. They bled profusely. They were entitled to some share in the fruits of victory. We do not want to encourage communism, nor help the Communists. We want the people of Yugoslavia to know that they can count on our friendship and help. We do not want them, for lack of help, to become 100 percent satellites of Russia.

Tito was sincere when he broke with Stalin. I saw in North Korea, in November 1950, a Russian propaganda poster in which Tito was in the same boat with Churchill, Franco, and Uncle Sam under a banner of skull and bones and the dollar sign.

Today, Tito wants peaceful co-existence with Russia. We want it too.

In conclusion, let us remember that our fleet, for the first time in history, patrols and refuels in the Mediterranean. It is, therefore, to our interest to cultivate peaceful relations with every nation in this area.

#### BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF DR. ELLIOTT P. JOSLIN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the very great doctors of medicine in this 20th century. He is not only a great doctor, an eminent specialist in the research and treatment of diabetes, but he is also a very great humanitarian.

Mr. Speaker, in this world of recent times, when so much substance and effort has been expended in the cause of destruction of mankind, it seems very fitting and proper that all of us here in Congress, and that the people throughout the Nation, and in a very large measure, throughout the world, should pause for a few moments to do honor to a very great man whose entire lifetime has been devoted to benefiting and helping mankind.

On Wednesday, June 6, Dr. Elliott P. Joslin, of Boston, Mass., celebrated his 87th birthday. An eminent scientist, a very distinguished doctor of medicine, his tremendous efforts and contributions to the health of mankind all over the world began in Victorian days over 60 years ago. Through the duration of the 20th century, his great achievements for human beings have made it possible for many to live and enjoy life who might otherwise not have been able to do so.

Many of his great achievements have taken place in the research and treatment of diabetes. In this field of medicine his knowledge and judgment and contributions are recognized throughout the world. His eminent authority is recognized not only because of his accomplishments in the field of medicine, but also because of the use of his knowledge

in the consideration of the whole man. Kindly, thoughtful, genuine, and always completely interested, Dr. Joslin, in all of his study and research and treatment, never has forgotten that mankind is made up of human beings with nerves, and a mind, and a spirit. Always he is cognizant of the fact he is dealing with life made in the image of God.

During these many years of service to his fellowmen, the eminent leadership of Dr. Joslin has been internationally recognized, not just for his specialty in the research and treatment of diabetes and the interrelationship of the whole man in the treatment of his ills, but also for his eminent qualities as a gentleman and a leader among men during this, his time on earth.

More intimately, Dr. Joslin is revered and loved by the countless patients who have passed through his great clinic in Boston bearing his name—the Joslin Clinic—and the countless people whose lives he has touched in his long, notable service throughout more than three score of years.

Not only is he an eminent man of medicine, but Dr. Joslin is a distinguished teacher and a great scientist. As a professor in the Harvard Medical School, many distinguished doctors today recall with reverence and appreciation their great teacher when they were students in the Harvard Medical School. His teaching and lectures have taken place in many of the great medical centers of the world. In the great profession of medicine, Dr. Joslin's place is secure.

In this age of materialism and conflict of values, the high accomplishments of so distinguished a man and specialist are indeed above praise. Admired, respected, and revered not only by everyone in his profession, but also by men and women everywhere, Dr. Joslin indeed has reached the pinnacle of greatness. In the history of his great and noble profession, and in the history of his country, his name will rank with Osler, Trudeau, Kelly, Welch, Halstead, Ehrlich, Cushing, and others who have done so much to permit men and women throughout the world to live normal, happy lives.

During this long life of service, Dr. Joslin has been blessed with the love, co-operation, encouragement, and understanding of a wonderful lady, his wife, Mrs. Joslin. It is my wish, and my hope, just as it is for countless individuals everywhere, that Dr. Joslin and Mrs. Joslin will be blessed with many more years, to do all that they love so well, which is to give health to the ill, strength to the physically weak, courage to the depressed, and happiness to mankind. Because he lives so do countless others.

On his 87th anniversary, I know he has received congratulations and best wishes from people all over the world. It is an honor for me to extend to him my congratulations and I know the congratulations of the entire Congress and Government of the United States of America.

#### ENCOURAGE SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and ex-

tend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, every American rejoices in present peak employment of our citizens and the unprecedented peacetime prosperity which the Nation is enjoying at this time.

There are many factors responsible for present conditions and prosperity not only involving the huge impact and substantial stimulating effects of the multi-billion-dollar defense and foreign spending programs but also entailing the tremendous growth of the Nation in terms of increased population, scientific research and development, and the emergence of new needs and new demands growing out of scientific and industrial advancements and the generally very great impetus which the American economy has received as the result of the new age of remarkable invention and progress into which we have entered since the end of World War II.

Great changes have occurred in industry and industrial technique which are bringing about fabulous transformations of industry, the economy and the direction and scope of our productivity and our lives. Where these remarkable changes will end, it would be impossible to predict. But it is clear that the trend is steadily and speedily toward such additional scientific and industrial growth and expansion that continued basic changes in our industrial, as well as our social life as a Nation are inevitable. We must be prepared for it.

This new era necessitates urgent consideration of measures to so direct the challenge of this growth and these changes as not to produce major dislocations in our productive system. Just as important, more so perhaps, is the need for guiding the truly revolutionary developments in science and industry so that the results they bring will be socially beneficial and productive of new and better opportunities and higher standards for all Americans. How these ends can best be achieved is necessarily among the challenging problems which this Congress, working with the executive branch of the Government, must determine, and in the process we can lose no time because it is most essential that both the law and jurisprudence already in some question, and administrative patterns, should at all times be fully implemented and adapted to the rapid growth and the new features of scientific, industrial development.

A present question we should ask is whether in this period conditions are developing in the Government and in the country which especially favor big business and militate against small business. Is there likelihood of the American economy developing principally into a relatively small number of large units tending toward monopoly, ultimately weakening, and finally destroying independent small business as we have known it in the past? Every industry should be judged on its merits or demerits, not with reference to its bigness alone, but

principally with reference to how it is serving the Nation and the people.

Scientific progress is necessary, industrial growth is desirable. Both will ensure in the years ahead in greater measure than ever before. But how will they serve the people, how will they promote the freedom, economic health, and social welfare of the individual? How will they be adapted to our free way of life? Can the trend toward bigness in American industry continue without finally excluding smallness altogether, without destroying, or greatly impairing and sapping, the vitality of some four million, two hundred thousand small business firms throughout the Nation which are, we are told and believe, the very backbone of our free enterprise system?

How can we interpret the high failure rate of small business and the current acute problem of taxes, labor relations, and reduced profits to which they are subjected? Can incentive of the individual continue in the face of management problems, extortionate taxes, financing difficulties, labor competition from big units, and higher operating costs?

In a sense, such problems are fairly academic so far as big business is concerned, but they can be and are matters of life and death to the small concern.

Big business can command the services of highly skilled managers and experts. It has the means of attracting the best brains from our colleges and universities and from the business world. Small business frequently has to take what is left, indeed a decreasing number of highly skilled leaders are willing to venture into the stormy seas of small business.

Big business has a much easier way of coping with tax problems not available to small business. It can also solve its labor problems on a broad, general basis and pass the burdens along to the consumers. Most small businesses cannot follow this course.

Big business has little difficulty securing new financing, whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for small business to finance current operations, let alone embark upon new ones. Big business can get an infinitely larger share of Government procurement and can pay able representatives to keep in constant contact with Federal Government needs and opportunities. As a general rule small business has to take what is left.

It is not surprising therefore that, according to late statistics, the profit margin before taxes for corporations with more than a hundred million dollars worth of assets before taxes was 13.4 percent while for firms with less than \$250,000 assets, it was only 2.6 percent of sales. Big business enjoys all the benefits of large-scale operations, cheaper prices for its raw materials, and cheaper distribution costs, and cheaper per unit market outlet. Small business is caught in the competitive squeeze and suffers disadvantage and detriment all along the line.

Is big business more efficient? Perhaps it is in some instances, not all. But efficiency is not the only standard by which American industry should be



measured. We must consider the effect on the individual, the effect on our way of life, the ultimate effect of giant trusts and combines vested with billions of assets exercising great power throughout the Nation and in the Government. We must consider whether these accompaniments of bigness will, in the long run, benefit our democratic system, promote social justice, and conduce to our free way of life. Or will they result in too much power and too much wealth vested in the hands of a few, the creation of an economic oligarchy, all powerful in the affairs of government, exercising monopolistic control over the American economy and American working men and women, steadily getting bigger and bigger, and finally constituting a giant industrial and financial network that will completely enmesh the individuality and the incentive as well as the opportunity of the average American?

Many of us remember the industrial merger period of the twenties and the final economic cataclysm of 1929. We are told that we have controls now which prevent the evils which grew out of that situation but that seems hardly an answer to the declining fortunes of small business in this country.

As one who believes that small business is indeed not only the backbone but the test and the proof of our free-enterprise system, I urge upon this Congress very early consideration of pending measures to insure small business in its essential right under our system to continue to exist and to be safeguarded against the monopolistic and unfair competition and governmental discrimination which so often besets it in our times.

These remedies lie in the field of taxation, Government procurement, and other fields. They should be pressed now. They should be pressed for the economic and social welfare of the Nation and for the sake of preserving freedom of individual action in all its legitimate essentials.

#### SOMETHING TO CELEBRATE

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, notable anniversaries of two outstanding national events are now sufficiently close upon us as to be subjects for attention by the Congress. Both, undoubtedly, will be celebrated on a nationwide scale under congressional sponsorship. To properly and thoroughly prepare these celebrations in the best American tradition requires an early start. As a basic preliminary, authorization by the Congress is essential to permit the Government departments concerned to take any action. Hence the facts are here presented:

These two top-ranking anniversaries are the sesquicentennial of our National Anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner, and the golden jubilee of the opening of the Panama Canal, exactly 1 month apart.

The year is 1964, 8 years away; but as preparations must be complete by 1963, and another year may be lost in the pressure of the current presidential campaign, there may be actually only 6 years. Procrastination causing later hurry can greatly diminish effects, and at the same time disproportionately boost costs.

Another pressing reason for an early start is that in the same year, 1964, come other important anniversaries of national interest, celebration plans for which already have been underway more than a year. These include the Tercentennial of Founding of New York and New Jersey as American Colonies, the 350th anniversary of the Settlement of New York City, and the 300th of that city's present name.

The New York-New Jersey Tercentennial Association, in its campaign of preparation, announces that it intends celebration of the two national anniversaries in its own program. It is, however, entirely willing to subordinate its own interests within the national plans which Congress may desire to promulgate, pledging full support.

Recognizing the vast possibilities of an adequate celebration of these national anniversaries, I also realize that two of our most populous and economically important States form a center around which about one-third of the national economy revolves. Therefore, I propose that the Congress take action to stimulate preparation for these outstanding national celebrations. At the coming session, I expect to introduce bills to authorize the various Federal Departments to further these preparations so far as they are affected.

A further reason for a beginning is that the tercentennial group already has proposed a world's fair for 1964, and proclaims its intention of creating popular interest and demand for such an event. It has arranged some very unusual means of spurring this interest.

The Tercentennial Association is not asking congressional aid. It is a non-profit corporation under the laws of New Jersey, having no stock or shares nor any authority to carry on profitmaking activities. Its officers serve without salary. Its basic idea is maximum celebration of the several anniversaries in the best American tradition. Rather than seeking assistance, it desires to extend to the Congress full advantage of the local and sectional enthusiasm being churned up to provide greater power and effect for the national anniversary celebrations. It desires the national anniversaries to take first place, and offers to do all in its power toward their success.

#### BACKGROUND OF THE CELEBRATIONS

The Star-Spangled Banner was written by Francis Scott Key, inspired by the fact that the Stars and Stripes still floated proudly over Fort M'Henry, at Baltimore, after a British fleet had pounded the fort with shot and shell for a day and a night. On finding "By the dawn's early light that our flag was still there," on the morning of September 14, 1814, he penned the first stanza on the back of an envelope, completing it the day following.

The Panama Canal was opened to the traffic of the world on August 15, 1914, following 10 years of construction. Its effect has been worldwide to the benefit and credit of the United States. These two highly significant anniversaries are worthy of the Nation's best effort at celebration.

The Colonies of New York and New Jersey were created by King Charles II of England through grant to his brother James, Duke of York and Albany, on March 12, 1664. Shortly thereafter they were seized by the English from the Dutch who had made settlement earlier. At the time of seizure, the name New Amsterdam, given by the Dutch, was changed to New York City. It had been settled in 1613-14.

The plans of the New York-New Jersey Tercentennial Association include local observance of these anniversaries on various dates throughout 1964, together with celebrations of the more local anniversaries of municipal founding and incorporation.

Because of the many celebration dates and the intended magnificence of pageantry to continue throughout the year, 1964 has been named "the year of splendor."

It is as a most important part of this year of splendor that the Tercentennial Association desires the Congress make an initial move toward nationwide celebration of these two national anniversaries.

#### TRADE AGREEMENTS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 421)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

This message is submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

Under the authority of the trade agreements legislation, the United States entered into a trade agreement at Geneva, Switzerland, on May 23, 1956, with other contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. A copy of that agreement is submitted herewith. The United States received tariff concessions from other countries on various products exported by the United States in return for tariff concessions by the United States.

On two products the United States by separate action negotiated increases in the existing rates of duty. In one case, involving certain fur-felt hat bodies, a court decision had in effect nullified tariff increases which were proclaimed a few years ago as the result of an escape clause investigation. In its peril point investigation on these hat bodies, the Tariff Commission found that the lower rates resulting from the court decision should be increased. The negotiated increases raise the rates of duty to the peril points found by the Tariff Commission, and in general restore the rates

which had been applicable under the escape clause proclamation prior to the court decision. In the other case, involving liquid sugar, there had been no peril point finding that an increase was necessary; the objective was to equalize the rates applicable to dry and liquid sugar.

In the other two cases—certain tungsten alloys and violins and violas—in which the Tariff Commission reported that increases in existing rates of duty were required, it was found that the advantages of negotiating the increases would have been outweighed by attendant disadvantages which made it undesirable to accomplish the increases by this means. Also, in the case of tungsten alloys, only one group was listed for negotiation while others, including ferrotungsten, the most important in terms of imports, was not listed. Increasing the duty on the listed alloys would thus have unduly complicated our tariff structure without adequate economic justification. For these reasons, increased rates on tungsten alloys and violins and violas were not included in the trade agreement. These considerations would not be a bar to applications by domestic producers of these products for escape clause action under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 7, 1956.

#### ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT AND CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 526, Rept. No. 2282), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7992) to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### POSTAL RATES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 527, Rept. No. 2283), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11380) to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### EXTENSION OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 528, Rept. No. 2284), which was referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### DEFEAT H. R. 5550

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, with the administration using every possible device to promote the Organization for Trade Cooperation, we Members of Congress should utilize every opportunity to point out the dangers of the scheme to encroach upon our constitutionally delegated powers. Only by cooperative effort can we counteract the preachments of those ambitious Federal nabobs who are going forth throughout the land attempting to convince the public that Congress is short-sighted, stupid, or selfish in refusing to renounce a trust inherited from those to whom we owe the very existence of this republic.

Perhaps what Congress should have is a series of liaison offices at the White House from which to lobby for principles in which we believe. Certainly it has become the custom of the various Government departments to bring every pressure possible upon the legislative branch. In addition, the administration sends its spokesmen hither and yon in espousal of the various schemes concocted for the purpose of enabling the bureaucrats to

absorb an increasing number of functions and operations, whether or not these aspirations are in conformity with the precepts of the Constitution.

The State Department has taken a particular fancy to international trade. Whereas for almost a century and a half there was no challenging the right of Congress to regulate foreign commerce, the State Department through a series of unusual manipulations gradually seized an increasing amount of this vested power and now wants to share it with diplomatic connivers from all over the world.

Various other Departments have been solicited in this bold attempt to convince Congress that it should strip itself of the prerogative specifically assigned to it by our Founding Fathers. Members of the Cabinet and their respective entourages make repeated safaris to Capitol Hill to appear before congressional committees advocating legislation that would transfer congressional duties into the greedy hands of State Department personnel.

Cabinet members and their hirelings also seize every opportunity to attempt to contradict Members of Congress on such policy matters as our attitude toward the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Speeches made by the Secretaries and Department personnel are, of course, widely publicized by public information specialists who have become part and parcel of this modern bureaucratic establishment.

I note particularly that the Secretary of Commerce is very active on speakers' platforms on the subject of the OTC. His recent speeches before the World Trade Conference in New Orleans and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in Washington were devoted almost exclusively to the promotion of the OTC. Members of Congress who have witnessed the damage created by unfair trade policies realize the danger in placing further tariff powers in the hands of the State Department. The Secretary of Commerce says in effect that our findings are not authentic.

We West Virginians have had an expensive lesson from the State Department's foreign trade policies. We have seen thousands of miners and railroad workers thrown out of their jobs because of markets lost to foreign residual oil. We know that our great chemical industry, which is centered in my district, would suffer tremendous harm without proper tariff protection. The same situation applies in the case of pottery, glass, and other industries which constitute the economy of our state. Yet the executive department is contemptuous of these circumstances in its conspiracy to effect passage of H. R. 5550, through which our abdication in the matter of foreign commerce would become complete.

I am convinced that H. R. 5550, the bill to take the United States into the OTC will experience formidable opposition in the House if it gets to the floor. It is particularly pleasing to note that a growing number of colleagues from New England and the South have become alarmed at the latest attempts to place the executive department's thumb on the scales that were created to provide a balance of



powers between the departments of the Government.

The administration is also cognizant of this attitude on the part of Congress. That is why the Secretary of Commerce and other officials of the Federal Government are being sent around the Nation taking issue with our position.

As a duly elected Representative of the people of West Virginia, I resent the administration's tactics in this regard. I think it unfortunate that the administration persists in its campaign to neutralize public opposition to the attempted further usurpation of congressional powers. I trust that every Member of Congress who recognizes the dangers involved in State Department foreign trade policies will be on guard until H. R. 5550 is pigeonholed or defeated. Meanwhile, we must continue to resist the deplorable activity of the administration's pressurized Cabinet and the ever-growing Government lobby to which we are constantly exposed.

#### WALTER REUTHER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers, and a vice president of the AFL-CIO, is a distinguished citizen of my native Detroit, of the State of Michigan, of our Nation, and of the world. He is respected and loved by the friends he has made in more than 20 years of courageous and untiring championship of the cause of labor; likewise, Mr. Speaker, as with my own father, the late Congressman John Dingell, he is known and admired for the enemies that he has made.

All over America and wherever workmen organize or seek to organize to improve their lot throughout the entire world, Walter Reuther is respected for his idealism, his ideas, his practicality and his ability in translating the dreams of today into the realities of tomorrow, in terms of take-home pay, security on the job and increased human dignity in the shops, in the community and in the affairs of the Nation, for wage earners regardless of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry.

Walter Reuther is also known for his high integrity and for his successful efforts in his own union and in the CIO throughout its existence to keep both organizations clean of both Communist influence and racketeering. Both these evils are equally destructive of those human values which, only this week in the observance of the 20th anniversary of the union he helped to found, he said is the real reason for the existence of his or any other union.

I would like to set forth for the RECORD some documents which make clear Mr. Reuther's position and action in fighting against crime and corruption in the labor movement.

The first of these is an excerpt from his speech at the UAW convention in 1953 in Atlantic City and the second is his keynote speech to the CIO convention in Los Angeles, Calif., in 1954.

In both utterances he stated his position and that of the UAW. It was that a determination to cleanse and keep

clean the labor movement of racketeering was a condition of labor unity.

ON LABOR UNITY—EXCERPT FROM REMARKS BY UAW AND CIO PRESIDENT WALTER P. REUTHER TO THE UAW 14TH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, MARCH 22, 1953, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

What are the other things we think need doing? The CIO had a problem, a serious internal problem. Overwhelmingly, the CIO, its leadership and its membership was not communistic; yet we had a small Communist minority. We did everything in the CIO we could to get those Communist-dominated unions to clean up their own house and put their own affairs in order.

After the CIO had given them proper notice and every opportunity to straighten out their own house, and they failed, we said, "You cannot act in behalf of the Communist Party and use the good name of the CIO on your banners."

When these unions would not clean house, after due process in Cleveland, we in the CIO kicked the Communists out of the leadership of the CIO.

We look with hope at the action of the American Federation of Labor at its Miami meeting some weeks ago. The AFL looked at the New York dock situation, where racketeering and underworld influence is rampant, and said they were going to move in there.

We in the CIO don't believe the kind of labor movement we belong to can tolerate racketeering any more than we are willing to tolerate communism in the leadership of our own movement. We believe we can command the respect of the rank and file as well as the general public only if we keep these kinds of unsavory elements out of leadership.

These are some of the principles we are going to think about when we enter these negotiations. We will do everything in our power to extend the hand of fellowship to the American Federation of Labor. We hope we can get together.

EXCERPT FROM KEYNOTE SPEECH BY CIO PRESIDENT WALTER P. REUTHER, DECEMBER 6, 1954, OPENING THE CIO CONVENTION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

We pray that such a sound, honorable and principled basis for labor unity will be possible, and we pledge to this convention that we shall do everything humanly possible to bring about such a sound, principled, and honorable basis for labor unity at the earliest possible time.

The past year has brought into sharp focus another serious problem inside the labor movement. The question of unethical and corrupt practices on the part of certain anti-social elements that found their way into the American labor movement has been called to our attention, and I am proud to be able to join with other CIO leaders in saying that the CIO has a clean labor movement. I am equally proud to say we are going to keep it that way. Just as we stepped up to the problem and the challenge and the moral responsibility of meeting the problem of communism, so we will meet this problem of corruption with the same courage and the same determination. If there is corruption in the CIO, it is in a few isolated places that we haven't found out, and when we do find it we will deal with it without fear or without favor because we will not tolerate it. To facilitate the CIO's work in this field, we have created a special committee on ethical practices, headed by our good friend, the president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Jack Potofsky, and supported by the president of the NMU, Joe Curran, and the vice president of the United Steelworkers, Brother Jim Thimmes.

We in the CIO consider the leadership in the CIO nationally and in the leadership of

any of our affiliates as a matter of public trust, as a sacred obligation and responsibility to the rank and file whom we have the privilege and the honor of representing. We respect the autonomy of our affiliated unions and we shall do everything we can to protect that autonomy. But we in the CIO are unwilling, under the slogan of autonomy, to look the other way and permit corruption to be practiced under the slogan of autonomy. A CIO charter is not a license that people hang on the wall so that they can do anything they please. A CIO charter is both a privilege and an obligation, and we say if you want the right to have the good name of CIO, then you are required to conduct yourself in keeping with the ethical and moral standards of the CIO. No one in our movement will be tolerated if they attempt to put personal gain above the welfare of the membership.

This convention, I am confident, will take action and make it crystal clear not only in the CIO, to the CIO members, but to the public generally that we in the CIO will not tolerate Communists or crooks in the leadership of our movement. We have said many times that when you find a corrupt labor leader who has taken bribes or who has carried out unethical practices relating to the administration of welfare funds, or any other trade union responsibilities, that that corrupt labor leader ought to be kicked out of the labor movement and he ought to be put in jail. But, we go farther than that. We believe that the employer who bribed the corrupt labor leader ought to occupy the next cell in the same jail. And we believe further that where insurance brokers who perform no necessary social functions in the negotiation of collective bargaining agreements as they relate to insurance programs, are guilty of unethical practices, of bribes, and kickbacks, in the corruption of labor leadership, there ought to be a third cell reserved for them so that they can put the three of them in a row, because they belong together.

We know that corruption in the labor movement comes about because these anti-social elements begin to apply the ethical standards of the business community to trade union leadership. It may be perfectly all right for a businessman to make a deal and get a kickback on insurance policies, but in the labor movement that runs contrary to the basic moral code that we believe in, and therefore we cannot tolerate it.

The American labor movement will either create machinery within its whole internal structure to deal with the problem of corruption, we will either clean the house of American labor ourselves with a stiff, strong broom—or our enemies will try to clean it with an ax in an effort to destroy or weaken the American labor movement.

I say this is the hour when labor had better step up to this responsibility with courage and take care of this problem themselves within the house of labor so that no one else will have to clean our house for us.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to enter a copy of a letter which Mr. Reuther sent to Mr. Max Greenberg, president of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, CIO, on September 16, 1954, in which he directed Mr. Greenberg to correct immediately certain malpractices which had appeared in that union in connection with welfare funds and they were forthwith corrected:

TEXT OF LETTER FROM CIO PRESIDENT WALTER P. REUTHER TO PRESIDENT MAX GREENBERG OF THE RETAIL, WHOLESALE, AND DEPARTMENT STORE UNION, CIO, PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 16, 1954

I have read with deep concern newspaper reports of obvious malpractices by certain local officials of the Retail, Wholesale, and

Department Store Union, in connection with the administration of welfare funds.

According to the reports of official hearings by the New York Insurance Department, officials of a number of local unions of your international organization have admitted to practices which cannot be condoned by any decent trade union.

Welfare funds administered by union officials are a sacred trust. The funds are set up for the specific purpose of creating security and health protection for the members of the organization and their families. It is shocking beyond words to find any single instance of these funds being used as a special financial preserve with which to enrich the officers of the union or the administrators of the welfare fund.

I have always been proud of the CIO's record of integrity, and its freedom from this or any other type of corruption and racketeering.

Through the years, the Congress of Industrial Organizations has adopted, and reaffirmed as CIO policy, a statement of ethical practices, which asserts, "the determination of the CIO and its affiliated unions to wage war on unethical practices within and without the trade-union movement."

That statement of CIO policy will not be—so long as I serve the CIO as its president—a deadletter statement. I have said time and again that I will fight corruption wherever I find it—within or without the labor movement.

I believe that the union official who preys upon the rights or funds of union members has no place in the labor movement and should be sent to jail.

It has been a matter of deep concern to me that during the past 3 days there has been no statement from you or other responsible officials of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union concerning these shocking revelations and admissions before the insurance department of New York State.

It is clear that this situation requires prompt remedial action by the international officers of your union.

The national CIO in years past has concerned itself with Communist domination of affiliated unions. The national CIO has the same moral obligation to concern itself with evidence of racketeering in its affiliated unions.

So far as the CIO is concerned, we do not recognize any autonomous right to practice the corruption of crime or communism. We in the CIO cannot and will not tolerate crooks or Communists in the labor movement.

Accordingly I call upon you, as president of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, to take prompt remedial action against the local officials involved in the malpractices disclosed at these hearings. I am placing this matter on the agenda of the meetings of the executive committee and the executive board of the Congress of Industrial Organizations at our headquarters in Washington on October 4-5; and I will expect a full report of the corrective action taken by your union against individuals named in these hearings and any others against whom there is a legitimate charge of racketeering or maladministration.

On the basis of that report the executive committee and the executive board of the Congress of Industrial Organizations will make a determination as to their future course of action in this matter.

This position was restated again in his report to the CIO executive board February 24, 1955, an excerpt of which I enter in the RECORD. By this time his proposition of a determined fight against racketeering had become a part of the

merger agreement between CIO and AFL.

#### THE QUESTION OF CORRUPTION

(From The New Beginning, an address by President Walter P. Reuther, February 24, 1955, to the CIO executive board, discussing the merger agreement between the CIO and AFL which was subsequently approved by the CIO executive board)

We come to section (g) of the agreement dealing with the question of corruption. I don't want to belabor that. On repeated occasions the CIO has demonstrated its dedication to keeping the labor movement free and clear of corruption and communism and all other forms that find expression in the kind of evils, the kind of destruction of the moral and social and ethical values that we believe in. We said that we would fight corruption without fear or favor. We said that a charter granted to an autonomous union is not a license that you hang on the wall and go out and do as you please in advancing the selfish interests of people in positions of leadership and power. A charter is not only a grant of rights, it is also a fixing of obligations and moral and social responsibilities. We made this very clear, and at the CIO convention in Los Angeles I said that if the labor movement did not create internal machinery to clean up its own house with a stiff broom, then we could get repressive legislation, and antilabor forces would do the job with a meat ax and try to destroy our labor movement in the process.

We have laid down in this document the constitutional declaration that we are determined to keep the united labor movement free of corruption and racketeering, free of Communist penetration, and we provide appropriate internal machinery to implement those principles. The agreement is very specific. It says, "The merged federation shall establish appropriate internal machinery with authority effectively to implement this constitutional determination to keep the merged federation free from any taint of corruption or communism."

Now, I have not been around as long as some of our old friends here today, but I have been around long enough to know that keeping the labor movement clean is not an easy job. We live in a society in which the acquisition of material wealth and personal gain is considered the measurement of success. In a society with an acquisitive philosophy it is perfectly understandable how a labor movement can become corrupted, and it becomes corrupted when you apply within the labor movement the standards of personal conduct that are accepted as perfectly proper in the business community. When a businessman makes a fast million dollars, he is looked to as a real sharp, successful businessman. But when a labor leader makes a fast buck, he is corrupt. In a society in which getting ahead in the world and accumulating material wealth and making personal gain—when that is the measurement of your success, when those are the moral standards, when those are the social values by which you measure people in our society, it is understandable that the impact of that philosophy obviously has a bearing upon the labor movement.

Therefore, let us understand that it will clearly require bold courage to cleanse the labor movement of corruption, and it will require eternal vigilance to keep it clean. It is not an easy job, and if you think a united labor movement is going to mean we can sit back and say we have the declaration, we have the machinery, the job is won, you are deluding yourselves. This is a matter of constant struggle and vigilance because it means fighting little compromises that lead to big compromises, and big compromises to corruption. The most corrupt unions in the old labor movement didn't get that way over-

night. It is not a conscious process. It is a process of little compromises, cutting corners here and cutting corners there until finally the values are so confused that people are going down the wrong road. We have the tools but they need to be used with courage.

I think I know something about the forces that we will have to meet, but I think the job can be done. I think there is a lot of good will in the AFL. There are a lot of honorable people in the AFL leadership, and I think with the leadership that is in the AFL, in cooperation, in good faith and good will with the leadership of the CIO, we can meet this problem, although it will be difficult and it will challenge the best that we have within us. I think, however, that we are equal to that challenge.

On the question of structure, I think that we have laid the basis for a sound structure within the united labor movement. Section 3 provides that there shall be created a Council of Industrial Organizations. That will be a body to which any industrial union may affiliate. It means that CIO industrial unions, it means that unions in the AFL who are industrial in character, can belong. That will be the machinery within the united organization through which we can coordinate and develop the kind of practical working liaison between the industrial unions dealing with their common problems.

The scope of the activities of that council is a matter which we can determine. It depends on the resources we want to put into it. It depends upon what we think its proper functions ought to be. That is a matter that we can talk out among ourselves and I think work out an agreement and a meeting of the minds.

In nominating Mr. George Meany as president of the merged labor movement at the AFL-CIO convention, December 5, 1955, in New York City, Mr. Reuther stated his position again in this matter, and I would like to enter that excerpt from his nominating speech.

EXCERPT FROM SPEECH BY WALTER P. REUTHER, PRESIDENT, UAW, NOMINATING GEORGE MEANY FOR PRESIDENT OF AFL-CIO, DECEMBER 5, 1955, NEW YORK CITY

Through years of dedicated service he has won the loyalty and the respect and friendship of millions of workers throughout our great country. He is a man with great courage and deep conviction, a man of intelligence, a man of courage and integrity. He loves justice, but he hates injustice and all forms of tyranny. His has been the strong and clear voice speaking out against racial intolerance and discrimination in our national life. His has been the voice warning labor that it must clear its house of corruption and those who would compromise the ethical and moral values which have symbolized the greatness of our free labor movement. He has made an outstanding contribution not only in America, but in the world labor movement. He has served as a vice president of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and in that capacity has made a great contribution mobilizing forces of the free world in the struggle against the vile, ugly, and immoral forces of Communist tyranny. His was among the earliest voices in the ranks of labor urging unity, making it understood that no one should have a vested interest in division and disunity. He understood from the very beginning that the whole labor movement transcends in importance the interests of any section of the labor movement, even though it may be your own section. He believed within the family of a united labor movement there would be worked out a proper, harmonious, and con-



structive relationship between both craft and industrial unions, both being recognized as equal and necessary, both having a great deal more in common than they have in conflict.

In Look magazine, February 28, 1956, Mr. Reuther said:

**THE UAW IS CLEAN OF RACKETEERING**

(Statement by Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, to Look magazine, February 28, 1956)

The problem raised by Look magazine in its current issue is one that must receive and is receiving the most serious and grave attention of responsible elements in the American labor movement.

The UAW is proud of its record in this respect. It has been kept clean of all racketeering and other forms of corruption. We are going to keep it that way.

The only irregularity on the part of a CIO union in this area during the history of my presidency of that organization was corrected as soon as the CIO officers had knowledge of it by prompt and vigorous action. This was the case of a local union of retail workers in New York City where misuse of welfare funds was brought to light. As CIO president, I directed officers of the international union to correct the situation within 48 hours and when they failed to do so, the CIO itself acted promptly and effectively.

It is true that the officers of international and national unions affiliated to the AFL-CIO have the first responsibility in keeping their unions clean. When they fail to act, however, it is the responsibility of the officers of the parent organization to protect the welfare of the members of all AFL-CIO unions against the misuse and abuse of its reputation and good name.

Any such action must be based on facts—not hearsay. But when the facts are there, the officers of the AFL-CIO have the responsibility to take action with courage and conviction through the machinery created for that purpose—the ethical practices committee of the executive council. The ethical standards set up in the AFL-CIO constitution must be applied equally to all unions without fear or favor, regardless of size or influence.

Although I am not a member of the ethical practices committee, I was one of those who pressed for its establishment as an integral part of the merged organization. It has had and will continue to have my full support and cooperation in eliminating any corruption that exists within the labor movement.

Leadership in the American labor movement must be considered a sacred trust and there must be no place or tolerance for either crooks or Communists.

The autonomous rights of every affiliated union must be respected and protected. However, autonomy must not be used by affiliated unions to shield corrupt practices nor must the leadership of the merged labor movement use autonomy as a convenient excuse for inaction and indecision.

It was on the initiative of Mr. Reuther that the applications of two unions for affiliation with the industrial union department of the AFL-CIO, of which Mr. Reuther is president, are being held up because a question of racketeering in their ranks has been raised, as shown by a New York Times news report of March 16, 1956, in which Mr. Reuther said, "We are going to keep this department clean."

I insert the text of that item at this point in my remarks:

**LABOR UNIT DELAYS ENTRY OF TWO UNIONS**

WASHINGTON, March 15.—A unit of the merged labor movement questioned today the ethics of two unions.

The executive board of the industrial union department, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, held up their membership applications until it was determined whether the applying unions' ethical practices conformed with the principles of the federation's constitution.

"We are going to keep this department clean," said Walter P. Reuther, IUD president, at a news conference after the board's first meeting.

He refused to identify the two unions.

The IUD perpetuates in symbol and practice the old CIO within the merged organization. Three applications approved today raised the total affiliates to 72 with a membership of nearly 7 million.

The three unions admitted were the Transport Workers Union of America, the Stove Mounters International Union of North America, and the American Federation of Hosiery Workers.

And finally, within the last few weeks, in speaking before the convention of the Textile Workers Union of America here in Washington on May 17, 1956, Mr. Reuther pledged his complete support to all efforts to rid the labor movement of corrupt elements. I enter this excerpt from that speech:

**NO ROOM FOR CROOKS OR COMMUNISTS**

(Excerpts from address by UAW President Walter P. Reuther before the Textile Workers Union convention, May 17, 1956)

I believe that the united labor movement needs to take effective and determined steps to free the American labor movement of those unethical, corrupt elements inside the leadership of the unions.

I believe that the great and vast majority of the leadership of the American labor movement is composed of honest, dedicated trade unionists, people who have made great sacrifice in a personal sense to build the labor movement, but unfortunately there is a handful who have attached themselves to the labor movement, not to build the movement, not to advance the welfare of the rank and file, but to feather their own nests. I say that just as we in the CIO did a good job of cleaning Communists out of leadership, we need to do the same kind of thorough job to clean out the crooks and racketeers.

There should be no room in the leadership of American labor for either crooks or Communists, and we need to meet this challenge without fear or favor. As long as this small handful continues to corrupt and blacken our name, so long shall we be vulnerable in the eyes of the American public, so long will the reactionary political forces, who strangely enough play politics with the most corrupt elements in the American labor movement, exploit this problem and use it against us.

I believe that we need to support the efforts of George Meany at the head of our organization, and of Al Hayes as chairman of the ethical practices committee, and courageously implement the kind of program that will effectively deal with the problem of corruption and racketeering wherever we find these ugly and immoral forces, whether in small or large unions.

I have unlimited confidence that George Meany and Al Hayes with our support will and can do this kind of a job.

We ought to say to the people of America when we catch a crook inside of the labor movement, he ought to go to jail.

And when we find an employer who has bribed a corrupt labor leader, that crooked employer ought to be put in the next cell, in the same jail.

The kind of free labor movement that we believe in must make leadership a sacred trust, and not an opportunity to feather one's nest and make a fast buck. If these people want to get rich, if they want to make a fast, easy buck, that's their business, but we must insist that they do it outside of the American labor movement and not inside the American labor movement.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McCONNELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 6 weeks, on account of official business.

**SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED**

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. JARMAN, for 1 hour, on June 12.

Mr. DINGELL, for 15 minutes, on today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include two letters.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. JENNINGS and to include an address by Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

**ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED**

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2480. An act to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas;

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico; and

H. R. 5237. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden.

**SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED**

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion.

S. 1244. An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 2498. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument;

S. 3332. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 3920. An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 6, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; and

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 8, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1937. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and certain schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1938. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Maj. Clarence E. Woods"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1939. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Kim Chung Hi"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1940. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the court's opinion rendered in the case of *Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley and Husband, Jack Conley v. the United States* (Congressional No. 3-54), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and pursuant to House Resolution 491, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1941. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1942. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pur-

suant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1943. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1944. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1945. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1946. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 221. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in western Oklahoma; with amendment (Rept. No. 2269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9742. A bill to provide for the protection of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga., against damage from fire and drought; without amendment (Rept. No. 2270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1275. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitariums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions; without amendment (Rept. No. 2272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11487. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended; without amendment (Rept. 2273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11488. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11002. A bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4697. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia of 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11320. A bill to amend certain laws effecting the control of narcotics in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1739. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Eighteenth intermediate report pertaining to the effect of Department of the Interior and REA policies on public power preferred customers (Rept. No. 2279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5712. A bill to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto; with amendment (Rept. No. 2281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 526. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7992, a bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2282). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 527. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 11380, a bill to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2283). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 528. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2284). Referred to the House Calendar.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11489. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4993. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain im-



provements to business property situated in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 11650. A bill to amend part III of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11651. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11652. A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11653. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11654. A bill to amend section 752 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 11655. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) to permit payment of the burial allowance where discharge requirements are or have been met through a change by competent authority; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 11656. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, to authorize the Hawaiian Homes Commission to approve and guarantee additional loans to Hawaiian Homes' homesteaders by private financing institutions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 11657. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a wife or widow, or a dependent husband or widower, may be entitled to benefits thereunder even though not actually living with the insured individual at the time required for entitlement to such benefits if found to have been abandoned or deserted by such individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 11658. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 11659. A bill to amend Public Law 587, 83d Congress, by authorizing the Federal Government to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11660. A bill to amend Public Law 587, 83d Congress, by deferring implementation requirements and requiring report by management specialists; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 11661. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, to provide that, with respect to beach-erosion projects, the deposit of

sand fill shall be considered to be construction under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 11662. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11663. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11664. A bill to enable the people of Alaska to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 11665. A bill to amend section 28 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky:

H. R. 11666. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide for the payment, to States and political subdivisions with respect to low-rent housing projects, of certain additional amounts in lieu of taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 11667. A bill to amend paragraph 1530 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the classification and rate of duty on certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 11668. A bill to provide for an additional payment of \$165,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., toward the cost of the water filtration plant constructed by such village; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 11669. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H. R. 11670. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11671. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11672. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Peoria Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 11673. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall establish a national cemetery in Fort Reno, Okla., on certain lands presently under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 11674. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and

to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 11675. A bill to provide for the donation of certain cotton and cotton materials to States for use by needy persons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 643. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 529. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2279, a report of the Committee on Government Operations on the effect of Department of the Interior and Rural Electrification Administration policies on public power preference customers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Res. 530. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of racketeering in labor unions within the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that appropriations be expedited and that any additional needed enabling legislation to bring into being the main upper Allegheny Dam and other uncompleted units of the Allegheny Valley flood-control system, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 11676. A bill for the relief of Sarah Reid (Maria Luise Brenten); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 11677. A bill to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, USAR (retired), to the grade of Lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 11678. A bill for the relief of Myer Leveen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 11679. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Russo Roca Marsilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 11680. A bill for the relief of Ahm Me Cha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Res. 531. Resolution to refer the bill H. R. 5461 to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

1120. Mr. CRUMPACKER presented a petition of Mr. R. M. Morris, of Elkhart, Ind., and other residents of Elkhart County, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.